

5/18/10

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

98 CR 1101 (ILG)

FILED UNDER SEAL

FELIX SATER,

Defendant.
-----X

DECLARATION OF KELLY MOORE

KELLY MOORE declares as follows:

1. I am member of the Bar of this Court and am a member of the law firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, 101 Park Avenue, New York, New York, 10178, counsel for Felix Sater.

2. I make this declaration in support of Mr. Sater's application to this Court to (i) order the immediate return of certain confidential materials, much of which were previously sealed by this Court in connection with criminal proceedings before this Court; and (ii) conduct an inquiry into how certain persons acquired the materials and to whom the materials were distributed in order to ensure that all such materials are returned or destroyed.

Background

3. Mr. Sater was the subject of criminal proceedings before this Court, which concluded on October 23, 2009, index number 98 CR 1101 (ILG) (the "Criminal Proceedings").

4. This Court sealed the docket and filings in the Criminal Proceedings.

5. In connection with the Criminal Proceedings, certain confidential materials were sealed including:

- a Cooperation Agreement dated December 10, 1998;
 - A United States Department of Justice Financial Statement dated December 10, 1998; and
 - a Pre-sentence Investigation Report dated June 18, 2004 (the “2004 PSR”);
- (together, the “Sealed Materials”).

6. In addition, Mr. Sater and the United States Attorney’s Office entered into a confidential Proffer Agreement dated October 2, 1998 (together with the Sealed Materials, the “Sealed and Confidential Materials”).

7. The confidential nature of the Sealed and Confidential Materials is plain. For example, the 2004 PSR states: “It is the policy of the federal judiciary and the Department of Justice that further redisclosure of the pre-sentence report is prohibited without the consent of the sentencing judge.”

8. Mr. Sater was formerly affiliated with a real estate development firm known as Bayrock Group LLC (“Bayrock” and together with its subsidiaries, the “Bayrock entities”).

9. Mr. Sater has informed us that, while he was associated with Bayrock, he kept the Sealed and Confidential Materials in a personal file in his Bayrock office.

**The Delaware Court Dismissed an Action Filed by
Mr. Kriss and His Attorney, Fred Oberlander**

10. Jody Kriss is a former employee of Bayrock.

11. During the course of his employment, Mr. Kriss maintained an office adjacent to Mr. Sater's. As noted above, Mr. Sater kept the Sealed and Confidential Materials in a personal file in his Bayrock office.

12. Mr. Kriss was employed by Bayrock from 2003 to 2007 as Director of Finance. In 2007, he took a leave of absence. He returned from leave for a brief period in 2008 and then was terminated by the Company.

13. In or around 2009, Mr. Kriss commenced an action in the Delaware Chancery Court against, inter alia, Mr. Sater, certain Bayrock entities and certain employees of Bayrock entities (the "Delaware Action").

14. In the Delaware Action, Mr. Kriss was represented by several attorneys including Mr. Fred Oberlander.

15. In the Delaware Action, Mr. Kriss alleged, inter alia, that the Bayrock entities constituted a racketeer influence and corrupt organization (RICO), that tax laws had been violated, and that Mr. Kriss – who was the Director of Finance at the time of the alleged violations – had been denied certain economic benefits to which he was entitled based on his association with Bayrock.

16. Chancellor Strine dismissed the Delaware Action, finding, inter alia, that Mr. Kriss's disputes with Bayrock and the other defendants are the subject of an arbitration agreement.

17. By order dated February 19, 2010, the Delaware court directed Mr. Kriss to file an arbitration and, in the event the arbitrator determined that the claims were

not arbitral, to file an action in court in New York. A copy of the order and the hearing transcript are attached as Exhibit 1.

**Attorney Oberlander's Other Client
Admits Taking Emails and Documents
From Bayrock**

18. In addition to the Delaware Action, another former employee of Bayrock, Joshua Bernstein, commenced an arbitration against Bayrock.

19. In that action, Mr. Bernstein testified that, during the course of his employment, he downloaded files from the computers and servers of Bayrock and installed monitoring software which allowed him access to other Bayrock personnel's computers. (See Ex. 2, Bernstein Deposition at 194-233).

20. Mr. Bernstein further testified that when he left Bayrock, he took "thousands" of emails and hundreds of documents (*Id.*)

21. Mr. Oberlander represents Mr. Bernstein.

**Messrs. Kriss and Oberlander File
a New Action in the SDNY, Using the
Sealed and Confidential Materials**

22. On Wednesday, May 12, 2010, Mr. Oberlander emailed to Ronald Kriss—a partner at the law firm Akerman Senterfitt and father of Jody Kriss—a draft complaint (the "SDNY Complaint") on behalf of Jody Kriss and another former Bayrock employee against Mr. Sater, Bayrock entities and numerous others.

23. The SDNY Complaint is similar in nature to the Delaware Action.

24. The SDNY Complaint references and attaches as exhibits thereto the Sealed and Confidential Materials.

25. In addition, the SDNY Complaint quotes numerous privileged communications between Bayrock and its counsel.

26. Mr. Oberlander's email to Ron Kriss stated as followed:

From: fred55@aol.com [mailto:fred55@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 12:33 PM
To: Kriss, Ronald (Sh-Mia); Kriss, Ronald (Sh-Mia)
Subject: Fwd: complaint, sdny, salomon, weinrich, & salomon & co.
Ron --

I recommend you forward this to Julius with the comment from me that there are three alternatives here:

- (a) I file publicly today.
- (b) I file under seal today.
- (c) He arrange a tolling agreement with EVERY defendant but nixon peabody.

I don't care how many people he has to get on the phone and how fast he has to work. He had years to give back the money and now it's over. He can get Brian Halberg to help him.

I believe it's possible to get this in under seal if Bayrock joins in a joint motion in part 1 to seal the complaint pending a redaction agreement with the assigned judge but there are never any guarantees.

Thanks,

FMO

A copy of this email is attached as Exhibit 3.

27. The "Julius" referenced in the above email is Julius Schwarz, an officer of Bayrock.

28. The above email, together with the draft SDNY Complaint and the exhibits thereto, were distributed by Ronald Kriss to Mr. Schwarz in the SDNY action. A copy was forwarded to Mr. Sater. We do not know how many times Mr. Oberlander's email was forwarded with the attachments.

29. On Thursday, May 13, 2010, Mr. Oberlander filed the SDNY Complaint in the Southern District of New York, and the matter was assigned to the Hon. Naomi Reice Buchwald.

30. The SDNY Complaint was made available to the public for download through a paid online news service, "Courthouse News." We do not know how many people downloaded the SDNY Complaint from Courthouse News.

31. Later that day, upon learning of the filing, my partner, Brian Herman, and I called Mr. Oberlander to demand that the Sealed and Confidential Materials be withdrawn and returned.

32. Mr. Oberlander informed us that he had retained his own counsel, an attorney named David Lewis, to address his disclosure of the Sealed and Confidential Materials.

33. Mr. Lewis refused to disclose how his client, Mr. Oberlander, had obtained the Sealed and Confidential Materials and refused to return the Sealed and Confidential Materials.

34. Mr. Lewis also stated that Mr. Oberlander had made an unsuccessful application to have the Materials filed under seal in the Southern District, and that he was amenable to a joint application to Judge Buchwald.

35. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Herman and I subsequently spoke with Judge Buchwald on May 13, and Judge Buchwald immediately issued an order preventing further dissemination of the SDNY Complaint, the exhibits thereto and the information therein (the "First Order"). (Exhibit 4). Judge Buchwald indicated during the telephone

conference that any application for return of the Sealed and Confidential Materials or inquiry into the disclosure should be directed to this Court.

36. On information and belief, a copy of the First Order was sent by Mr. Oberlander to each person to whom he had previously sent the SDNY Complaint. However, we do not know whether the SDNY Complaint and the exhibits were distributed further.

37. On May 14, 2010, at the request of Morgan Lewis, Courthouse News removed the SDNY Complaint from its website and sent a copy of the First Order to each person who had downloaded the SDNY Complaint.

38. On May 14, 2010, Judge Buchwald issued a second order (the "Second Order") sealing the SDNY Complaint in its entirety pending further order of the Court. (Exhibit 5). Judge Buchwald further ordered that a redacted version of the original complaint, redacting any sealed documents or references to sealed documents, be filed by May 19, 2010.

39. On May 17, 2010, Courthouse News ran a news story disclosing information from the SDNY Complaint. At the request of Morgan Lewis, the story was taken down, but we do not know how many people read the story while it was still posted.

Mr. Sater Seeks Relief

40. To summarize:

- Mr. Oberlander and one or more of his clients are in possession of the Sealed and Confidential Materials;

- Mr. Oberlander refuses to disclose how he obtained the Sealed and Confidential Materials and refuses to return them;
- Mr. Oberlander, aware of the confidential nature of the documents, has distributed the Sealed and Confidential Materials and the SDNY Complaint referencing the Sealed and Confidential Materials, and the recipients may have further distributed that information;
- As a direct result of Mr. Oberlander's actions, the SDNY Complaint referencing the Sealed and Confidential Materials was posted for download to the public and was used as the basis for a news article.

41. Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that this Court issue an order requiring Mr. Oberlander, his clients and anyone else who has received the Sealed and Confidential Materials or documents referencing the Sealed and Confidential Materials to immediately return all copies to Mr. Sater. Further, in order to fully effectuate relief, we ask that the Court conduct a hearing to determine how this disclosure occurred and the extent to which the Sealed and Confidential Materials were disseminated.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. Executed on May 18, 2010.


Kelly Moore

COURT OF CHANCERY
OF THE
STATE OF DELAWARE

LEO E. STRINE, JR.
VICE CHANCELLOR

New Castle County Courthouse
500 N. King Street, Suite 11400
Wilmington, Delaware 19801-3734

February 19, 2010

Stamatios Stamoulis, Esquire
Stamoulis & Weinblatt LLC
Two Fox Point Centre
6 Denny Road, Suite 307
Wilmington, DE 19809

Kathaleen St. J. McCormick, Esquire
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

John A. Elzufon, Esquire
Elzufon, Austin, Reardon
Tarlov & Mondell, P.A.
300 Delaware Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19801

RE: *Jody Kriss v. Bayrock Group, LLC, et al.*
C.A. No. 4154-VCS

Dear Counsel:

To my chagrin, I realized that the final order in this case was never entered. No one brought to my attention this omission. The order had been finalized but not entered some months ago. Here it is. I regret the delay. In future, if a delay of this ever occurs and it actually worries you, please contact my chambers. I do not like to create delay and this was an error of omission in filing, as the order had been finalized by me in late September.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Leo E. Strine, Jr.

Vice Chancellor

LESJr/eb

IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JODY KRISS, for himself and derivatively on behalf of the
Delaware limited liability companies Bayrock Spring Street
LLC, and Bayrock Whitestone LLC, the Arizona limited liability
company Bayrock Camelback LLC, the Florida limited liability
companies Bayrock Merrimac LLC, and Bayrock Ocean Club
LLC, and the New York limited liability company Bayrock
Group LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

BAYROCK GROUP LLC; RIF INTERNATIONAL GROUP,
INC.; TEVFIK ARIF; JULIUS SCHWARZ; MEL DOGAN;
DOGAN & ASSOCIATES; 2027 EMMON AVE LLC; FELIX
SATTER (aka FELIX SATER); VICTORIA SATER; ALEX
SALOMON; ALEX SALOMON & CO., PC; JOSEPH
BENCIVENGA; BUENA VISTA ALARGA LLC; BAYROCK
SPRING STREET LLC; BAYROCK WHITESTONE LLC;
BAYROCK HOLDINGS LLC; BAYROCK NATURAL
STONE LLC; BAYROCK SAPIR ORGANIZATION LLC; 246
SPRING STREET HOLDINGS II LLC; BAYROCK/SAPIR
ORGANIZATION HOLDINGS LLC; BAYROCK/SAPIR
ORGANIZATION REALTY LLC; 151-45 SIXTH ROAD
WHITESTONE PARTNERS LLC; CAMELBACK
DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS LLC; STILLMAN BAYROCK
MERRIMAC LLC; SB HOTEL ASSOCIATES LLC; 550
SEABREEZE DEVELOPMENT LLC,

True Defendants,

And

BAYROCK GROUP LLC; BAYROCK WHITESTONE LLC;
BAYROCK CAMELBACK LLC; BAYROCK MERRIMAC
LLC; BAYROCK OCEAN CLUB LLC; BAYROCK SPRING
STREET LLC,

Nominal Defendants.

C.A. No.:
4154-VCS

FINAL ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, this 19th day of February, 2010 for the reasons set
forth in the September 16, 2009 bench ruling of the Court, that:

1. As to all Defendants, all claims pled in the Complaint are dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, pursuant to Court of Chancery Rule 12(b)(1).
2. As to all Non-Resident Defendants named in the Complaint as defined in the Bayrock Defendants' Opening Brief, all claims pled in the Complaint are dismissed without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction, pursuant to Court of Chancery Rule 12(b)(2).
3. As to the Resident Defendants named in the Complaint as defined in the Bayrock Defendants' Opening Brief, all claims pled in the Complaint are dismissed without prejudice for failure to join indispensable parties, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(7).

Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed without prejudice, as opposed to with prejudice, solely so that the doctrine of *res judicata* does not preclude Plaintiff the opportunity to bring his claims before an arbitrator or, if certain claims are held not to be arbitrable, in a forum, such as the New York state courts, which can appropriately exercise jurisdiction over all Defendants and which is convenient. Of course, the reasons for dismissing this Complaint will retain their force into the future, and therefore an attempt by Plaintiff to bring these claims again in this Court will result in dismissal for the same reasons stated in the Court's bench ruling and which are summarized in this order.

/s/ Leo E. Strine, Jr.
Vice Chancellor

IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JODY KRISS, for himself and :
 derivatively on behalf of the Delaware :
 limited liability companies Bayrock :
 Spring Street LLC and Bayrock :
 Whitestone LLC, the Arizona limited :
 liability company Bayrock Camelback :
 LLC, the Florida limited liability :
 companies Bayrock Merrimac LLC and :
 Bayrock Ocean Club LLC, and the New :
 York limited liability company Bayrock :
 Group, LLC, :

Plaintiff, :

v :

Civil Action
 No. 4154-VCS

BAYROCK GROUP LLC; RIF INTERNATIONAL :
 GROUP, INC.; TEVFIK ARIF; JULIUS :
 SCHWARZ; MEL DOGAN; DOGAN & ASSOCIATES; :
 2027 EMMONS AVE LLC; FELIX SATTER :
 (a/k/a FELIX SATER); VICTORIA SATER; :
 ALEX SALOMON; ALEX SALOMON & CO, PC; :
 JOSEPH BENCIVENGA; BUENA VISTA ALARGA :
 LLC; BAYROCK SPRING STREET LLC; BAYROCK :
 WHITESTONE LLC; BAYROCK HOLDINGS LLC; :
 BAYROCK NATURAL STONE LLC; BAYROCK :
 SAPIR ORGANIZATION LLC; 246 SPRING :
 STREET HOLDINGS II LLC; BAYROCK/SAPIR :
 ORGANIZATION HOLDINGS LLC; BAYROCK/ :
 SAPIR ORGANIZATION REALTY LLC; 151-45 :
 SIXTH ROAD WHITESTONE PARTNERS LLC; :
 CAMELBACK DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS LLC; :
 STILLMAN BAYROCK MERRIMAC LLC; SB HOTEL :
 ASSOCIATES LLC; 550 SEABREEZE :
 DEVELOPMENT LLC, :

True Defendants, :

 CHANCERY COURT REPORTERS
 New Castle County Courthouse
 500 North King Street - Suite 11400
 Wilmington, Delaware 19801-3768
 (302) 255-0524

1 -and- :
2 :
3 :
4 :
5 :
6 :
7 :
8 :
9 :
10 :
11 :
12 :
13 :
14 :
15 :
16 :
17 :
18 :
19 :
20 :
21 :
22 :
23 :
24 :
25 :
26 :
27 :
28 :
29 :
30 :
31 :
32 :
33 :
34 :
35 :
36 :
37 :
38 :
39 :
40 :
41 :
42 :
43 :
44 :
45 :
46 :
47 :
48 :
49 :
50 :
51 :
52 :
53 :
54 :
55 :
56 :
57 :
58 :
59 :
60 :
61 :
62 :
63 :
64 :
65 :
66 :
67 :
68 :
69 :
70 :
71 :
72 :
73 :
74 :
75 :
76 :
77 :
78 :
79 :
80 :
81 :
82 :
83 :
84 :
85 :
86 :
87 :
88 :
89 :
90 :
91 :
92 :
93 :
94 :
95 :
96 :
97 :
98 :
99 :
100 :
101 :
102 :
103 :
104 :
105 :
106 :
107 :
108 :
109 :
110 :
111 :
112 :
113 :
114 :
115 :
116 :
117 :
118 :
119 :
120 :
121 :
122 :
123 :
124 :
125 :
126 :
127 :
128 :
129 :
130 :
131 :
132 :
133 :
134 :
135 :
136 :
137 :
138 :
139 :
140 :
141 :
142 :
143 :
144 :
145 :
146 :
147 :
148 :
149 :
150 :
151 :
152 :
153 :
154 :
155 :
156 :
157 :
158 :
159 :
160 :
161 :
162 :
163 :
164 :
165 :
166 :
167 :
168 :
169 :
170 :
171 :
172 :
173 :
174 :
175 :
176 :
177 :
178 :
179 :
180 :
181 :
182 :
183 :
184 :
185 :
186 :
187 :
188 :
189 :
190 :
191 :
192 :
193 :
194 :
195 :
196 :
197 :
198 :
199 :
200 :
201 :
202 :
203 :
204 :
205 :
206 :
207 :
208 :
209 :
210 :
211 :
212 :
213 :
214 :
215 :
216 :
217 :
218 :
219 :
220 :
221 :
222 :
223 :
224 :
225 :
226 :
227 :
228 :
229 :
230 :
231 :
232 :
233 :
234 :
235 :
236 :
237 :
238 :
239 :
240 :
241 :
242 :
243 :
244 :
245 :
246 :
247 :
248 :
249 :
250 :
251 :
252 :
253 :
254 :
255 :
256 :
257 :
258 :
259 :
260 :
261 :
262 :
263 :
264 :
265 :
266 :
267 :
268 :
269 :
270 :
271 :
272 :
273 :
274 :
275 :
276 :
277 :
278 :
279 :
280 :
281 :
282 :
283 :
284 :
285 :
286 :
287 :
288 :
289 :
290 :
291 :
292 :
293 :
294 :
295 :
296 :
297 :
298 :
299 :
300 :
301 :
302 :
303 :
304 :
305 :
306 :
307 :
308 :
309 :
310 :
311 :
312 :
313 :
314 :
315 :
316 :
317 :
318 :
319 :
320 :
321 :
322 :
323 :
324 :
325 :
326 :
327 :
328 :
329 :
330 :
331 :
332 :
333 :
334 :
335 :
336 :
337 :
338 :
339 :
340 :
341 :
342 :
343 :
344 :
345 :
346 :
347 :
348 :
349 :
350 :
351 :
352 :
353 :
354 :
355 :
356 :
357 :
358 :
359 :
360 :
361 :
362 :
363 :
364 :
365 :
366 :
367 :
368 :
369 :
370 :
371 :
372 :
373 :
374 :
375 :
376 :
377 :
378 :
379 :
380 :
381 :
382 :
383 :
384 :
385 :
386 :
387 :
388 :
389 :
390 :
391 :
392 :
393 :
394 :
395 :
396 :
397 :
398 :
399 :
400 :
401 :
402 :
403 :
404 :
405 :
406 :
407 :
408 :
409 :
410 :
411 :
412 :
413 :
414 :
415 :
416 :
417 :
418 :
419 :
420 :
421 :
422 :
423 :
424 :
425 :
426 :
427 :
428 :
429 :
430 :
431 :
432 :
433 :
434 :
435 :
436 :
437 :
438 :
439 :
440 :
441 :
442 :
443 :
444 :
445 :
446 :
447 :
448 :
449 :
450 :
451 :
452 :
453 :
454 :
455 :
456 :
457 :
458 :
459 :
460 :
461 :
462 :
463 :
464 :
465 :
466 :
467 :
468 :
469 :
470 :
471 :
472 :
473 :
474 :
475 :
476 :
477 :
478 :
479 :
480 :
481 :
482 :
483 :
484 :
485 :
486 :
487 :
488 :
489 :
490 :
491 :
492 :
493 :
494 :
495 :
496 :
497 :
498 :
499 :
500 :
501 :
502 :
503 :
504 :
505 :
506 :
507 :
508 :
509 :
510 :
511 :
512 :
513 :
514 :
515 :
516 :
517 :
518 :
519 :
520 :
521 :
522 :
523 :
524 :
525 :
526 :
527 :
528 :
529 :
530 :
531 :
532 :
533 :
534 :
535 :
536 :
537 :
538 :
539 :
540 :
541 :
542 :
543 :
544 :
545 :
546 :
547 :
548 :
549 :
550 :
551 :
552 :
553 :
554 :
555 :
556 :
557 :
558 :
559 :
560 :
561 :
562 :
563 :
564 :
565 :
566 :
567 :
568 :
569 :
570 :
571 :
572 :
573 :
574 :
575 :
576 :
577 :
578 :
579 :
580 :
581 :
582 :
583 :
584 :
585 :
586 :
587 :
588 :
589 :
590 :
591 :
592 :
593 :
594 :
595 :
596 :
597 :
598 :
599 :
600 :
601 :
602 :
603 :
604 :
605 :
606 :
607 :
608 :
609 :
610 :
611 :
612 :
613 :
614 :
615 :
616 :
617 :
618 :
619 :
620 :
621 :
622 :
623 :
624 :
625 :
626 :
627 :
628 :
629 :
630 :
631 :
632 :
633 :
634 :
635 :
636 :
637 :
638 :
639 :
640 :
641 :
642 :
643 :
644 :
645 :
646 :
647 :
648 :
649 :
650 :
651 :
652 :
653 :
654 :
655 :
656 :
657 :
658 :
659 :
660 :
661 :
662 :
663 :
664 :
665 :
666 :
667 :
668 :
669 :
670 :
671 :
672 :
673 :
674 :
675 :
676 :
677 :
678 :
679 :
680 :
681 :
682 :
683 :
684 :
685 :
686 :
687 :
688 :
689 :
690 :
691 :
692 :
693 :
694 :
695 :
696 :
697 :
698 :
699 :
700 :
701 :
702 :
703 :
704 :
705 :
706 :
707 :
708 :
709 :
710 :
711 :
712 :
713 :
714 :
715 :
716 :
717 :
718 :
719 :
720 :
721 :
722 :
723 :
724 :
725 :
726 :
727 :
728 :
729 :
730 :
731 :
732 :
733 :
734 :
735 :
736 :
737 :
738 :
739 :
740 :
741 :
742 :
743 :
744 :
745 :
746 :
747 :
748 :
749 :
750 :
751 :
752 :
753 :
754 :
755 :
756 :
757 :
758 :
759 :
760 :
761 :
762 :
763 :
764 :
765 :
766 :
767 :
768 :
769 :
770 :
771 :
772 :
773 :
774 :
775 :
776 :
777 :
778 :
779 :
780 :
781 :
782 :
783 :
784 :
785 :
786 :
787 :
788 :
789 :
790 :
791 :
792 :
793 :
794 :
795 :
796 :
797 :
798 :
799 :
800 :
801 :
802 :
803 :
804 :
805 :
806 :
807 :
808 :
809 :
810 :
811 :
812 :
813 :
814 :
815 :
816 :
817 :
818 :
819 :
820 :
821 :
822 :
823 :
824 :
825 :
826 :
827 :
828 :
829 :
830 :
831 :
832 :
833 :
834 :
835 :
836 :
837 :
838 :
839 :
840 :
841 :
842 :
843 :
844 :
845 :
846 :
847 :
848 :
849 :
850 :
851 :
852 :
853 :
854 :
855 :
856 :
857 :
858 :
859 :
860 :
861 :
862 :
863 :
864 :
865 :
866 :
867 :
868 :
869 :
870 :
871 :
872 :
873 :
874 :
875 :
876 :
877 :
878 :
879 :
880 :
881 :
882 :
883 :
884 :
885 :
886 :
887 :
888 :
889 :
890 :
891 :
892 :
893 :
894 :
895 :
896 :
897 :
898 :
899 :
900 :
901 :
902 :
903 :
904 :
905 :
906 :
907 :
908 :
909 :
910 :
911 :
912 :
913 :
914 :
915 :
916 :
917 :
918 :
919 :
920 :
921 :
922 :
923 :
924 :
925 :
926 :
927 :
928 :
929 :
930 :
931 :
932 :
933 :
934 :
935 :
936 :
937 :
938 :
939 :
940 :
941 :
942 :
943 :
944 :
945 :
946 :
947 :
948 :
949 :
950 :
951 :
952 :
953 :
954 :
955 :
956 :
957 :
958 :
959 :
960 :
961 :
962 :
963 :
964 :
965 :
966 :
967 :
968 :
969 :
970 :
971 :
972 :
973 :
974 :
975 :
976 :
977 :
978 :
979 :
980 :
981 :
982 :
983 :
984 :
985 :
986 :
987 :
988 :
989 :
990 :
991 :
992 :
993 :
994 :
995 :
996 :
997 :
998 :
999 :
1000 :
1001 :
1002 :
1003 :
1004 :
1005 :
1006 :
1007 :
1008 :
1009 :
1010 :
1011 :
1012 :
1013 :
1014 :
1015 :
1016 :
1017 :
1018 :
1019 :
1020 :
1021 :
1022 :
1023 :
1024 :
1025 :
1026 :
1027 :
1028 :
1029 :
1030 :
1031 :
1032 :
1033 :
1034 :
1035 :
1036 :
1037 :
1038 :
1039 :
1040 :
1041 :
1042 :
1043 :
1044 :
1045 :
1046 :
1047 :
1048 :
1049 :
1050 :
1051 :
1052 :
1053 :
1054 :
1055 :
1056 :
1057 :
1058 :
1059 :
1060 :
1061 :
1062 :
1063 :
1064 :
1065 :
1066 :
1067 :
1068 :
1069 :
1070 :
1071 :
1072 :
1073 :
1074 :
1075 :
1076 :
1077 :
1078 :
1079 :
1080 :
1081 :
1082 :
1083 :
1084 :
1085 :
1086 :
1087 :
1088 :
1089 :
1090 :
1091 :
1092 :
1093 :
1094 :
1095 :
1096 :
1097 :
1098 :
1099 :
1100 :
1101 :
1102 :
1103 :
1104 :
1105 :
1106 :
1107 :
1108 :
1109 :
1110 :
1111 :
1112 :<

1 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

2 ALL COUNSEL: Good morning, Your

3 Honor.

4 THE COURT: You may proceed.

5 MS. McCORMICK: Good morning, Your

6 Honor.

7 THE COURT: Good morning.

8 MS. McCORMICK: My name is Katie

9 McCormick. I'm an attorney with Young, Conaway,

10 Stargatt & Taylor. I'm joined today with my

11 colleague, Barry Willoughby. We represent a subset of

12 defendants in this action who we have referred to in

13 prior filings as the Bayrock defendants. Today, to

14 make it easier on myself, I will refer to these

15 defendants simply as defendants. So we do not argue

16 on behalf of all defendants in this action.

17 THE COURT: Who are you not arguing

18 on?

19 MS. McCORMICK: We are not arguing on

20 behalf of Mr. Salomon, the accountant; Mr. Salomon's

21 firm or Mr. Salomon's former employee, Mr. Bencivenga.

22 THE COURT: Does he have counsel?

23 MS. McCORMICK: He does.

24 MR. ELZUFON: He does, Your Honor. I

1 represent all three.

2 THE COURT: Did anyone move on his
3 behalf?

4 MR. ELZUFON: Your Honor, there's a
5 pleading filed on May 18th which gives my clients the
6 right to answer or otherwise respond 30 days after the
7 amended complaint was filed, because we've been
8 advised all along there's an amended complaint
9 forthcoming. I don't know what docket sheet it is in
10 the Court, but it was e-filed on May 18th, and I have
11 it right here.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MR. ELZUFON: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 MS. McCORMICK: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 We're here today arguing defendants'
16 motion to dismiss. Defendants were all engaged in
17 real estate development through subsidiaries managed
18 by defendant Bayrock Group LLC, a New York-based
19 limited liability company. Mr. Arif, a defendant in
20 this action, a Turkish citizen and a New York
21 resident, is the managing member of Bayrock Group.
22 Many of the Bayrock Group subsidiaries are listed as
23 defendants to this action, and nine of those 18
24 subsidiaries are not Delaware entities.

1 Through his complaint Mr. Kriss seeks
2 to enforce a November 10th employment agreement, which
3 we'll refer to today as the November 10th contract, in
4 which he was promised certain membership interests in
5 certain subsidiaries of the Bayrock Group. This
6 contract defines those entities as the company
7 entities. The contract, however, does not catalogue
8 these company entities. Various defendants have been
9 named in this suit by virtue of the plaintiff's claim
10 that they are, in fact, company entities under the
11 agreement. We dispute this.

12 Mr. Kriss' claim ultimately boils down
13 to whether Mr. Kriss is entitled to any moneys from
14 any of these real estate entities and, if so, how
15 much, if any at all. This question cannot be resolved
16 without turning to the November 10th contract which
17 governs when Mr. Kriss' membership interests, if any,
18 would vest and to what, if any, moneys in the form of
19 advancements or distributions Mr. Kriss would
20 ultimately be entitled.

21 This contract, which was negotiated in
22 New York and contains a New York choice-of-law
23 provision, contains a binding arbitration clause.
24 This makes sense, given that the uncatalogued entities

1 it was likely to affect were incorporated in a
2 multitude of different states. Because the key
3 question in this case is whether Mr. Kriss will be
4 entitled to any moneys from any of the defendant
5 entities, because this question cannot be resolved
6 without turning to the substantive terms of the
7 November 10th contract and because the
8 November 10th contract contains a binding arbitration
9 clause, this Court lacks jurisdiction over this
10 dispute, and the case should be dismissed.

11 But even absent the arbitration
12 clause, this dispute could not be entirely resolved in
13 Delaware, because this Court lacks jurisdiction over
14 20 of the 29 defendants and because many of those
15 defendants, including, at the very least, Mr. Arif and
16 the Bayrock Group, both of whom are signatories to the
17 November 10th contract are indispensable to this
18 action. For these reasons, the case should be
19 dismissed.

20 Defendants specifically have made
21 three arguments in support of dismissal. First, the
22 November 10th contract giving rise to plaintiff's
23 claims contains a binding arbitration clause which
24 should be enforced and which deprives this Court of

1 subject matter jurisdiction over this action. Because
2 the clear and unambiguous language of this clause
3 delegates the question of substantive arbitrability to
4 an arbitrator, we submit that this Court need not
5 consider whether plaintiff's claims are within the
6 scope of the arbitration clause at issue in order to
7 dismiss the action.

8 THE COURT: So we leave it to the
9 arbitrator.

10 MS. McCORMICK: Correct. In any
11 event, the claims are, in fact, within the scope of
12 the arbitration clause. And were this Court to
13 undertake the analysis, it would result in our favor.

14 THE COURT: What were your discussions
15 with the other side about this amended complaint? Why
16 did they not bring it forward, is your understanding?

17 MS. McCORMICK: I have no
18 understanding as to why they haven't filed an amended
19 complaint, Your Honor. It's, frankly, confusing to
20 us.

21 Second, this Court -- second, this
22 Court lacks personal jurisdiction over 20 of the 29
23 defendants in this action. Plaintiff bears the burden
24 of establishing a prima facie case for the exercise of

1 Group under Section 18-109 of the LLC long-arm
2 statute -- or LLC implied consent statute. We don't
3 think the act in itself is enough to establish
4 jurisdiction over the Bayrock Group or Mr. Arif. And
5 we don't think the allegations are specific enough to
6 support that claim.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have
8 anything else to add at this time?

9 MS. McCORMICK: I can continue, Your
10 Honor. Our third argument is based on the fact that
11 this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over
12 indispensable parties to this action, specifically at
13 the very least Mr. Arif and the Bayrock Group, but
14 also the company entities who plaintiffs contend are
15 signatories to the contract. We don't agree with this
16 assertion, but -- especially with respect to the
17 specific defendant entities; but because it's
18 plaintiff's contention and this motion is based on the
19 allegations in plaintiff's complaint, we don't think
20 that plaintiff can move forward without these
21 indispensable parties.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MS. McCORMICK: Should I proceed on
24 the factual background, Your Honor?

1 THE COURT: No. I'm good with that.
2 That's fine. Thank you. Let me hear from the other
3 side.

4 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you.

5 MR. STAMOULIS: Good morning, Your
6 Honor. Stam Stamoulis on behalf of Jody Kriss. I'd
7 just like to introduce our side. First with me is
8 Jody Kriss, the plaintiff in this matter; our New York
9 counsel, Fred Oberlander, and my partner Rich
10 Weinblatt.

11 THE COURT: Good morning.

12 MR. STAMOULIS: Now, Mr. Oberlander
13 will address the merits of arbitrability and the
14 employment contract and where our claim is coming
15 from. I just wanted to give the Court a brief bit of
16 background of who Mr. Kriss is and why we're here.

17 THE COURT: No, I don't need --

18 MR. STAMOULIS: No?

19 THE COURT: -- splitting an argument.
20 This is a motion to dismiss. Either handle it
21 yourself or have Mr. Oberlander handle it.

22 MR. STAMOULIS: Okay.

23 THE COURT: And I don't want to hear
24 facts not in the complaint.

1 MR. OBERLANDER: All right.

2 THE COURT: So I don't want to hear a
3 history of the world. This is a motion to dismiss.

4 For example, why was the motion -- why
5 is the amended complaint not on file?

6 MR. OBERLANDER: The amended complaint
7 is not on file because our prior -- my prior local
8 counsel in Delaware specifically advised me when I
9 said to him during its preparation "I think we need to
10 file a books and records before we do an amended
11 complaint because it will be full of derivative
12 complaints." And I understand from reading Your
13 Honor's transcript in a Bank of America hearing this
14 would be a very advisable thing to do. And counsel,
15 prior counsel wrote back in an e-mail and said it
16 would just be very foolish. Just rely on discovery
17 and go ahead and plead. He subsequently filed a
18 request to leave the case a week later for
19 irreconcilable differences, of which that was one; and
20 within 30 days I replaced him with these gentlemen.
21 And they've been working on the case for 75 days.

22 We have produced a great deal of
23 documents that have been filed. As to the specific
24 question of why the moment they came in we couldn't

1 file an amended complaint, it was their suggestion.
2 And the draft form of the amended complaint is quite
3 complex and very serious and implicates very many
4 serious charges against also new defendants who are
5 not before the Court and shouldn't be mentioned here,
6 that they said "No. You know what. We will argue the
7 motion to dismiss but make clear that we do want you
8 to file an amended complaint; No. 2, that the claims
9 in the amended" -- wait, wait --

10 THE COURT: No.

11 MR. OBERLANDER: He wanted a books and
12 records demand. So we did a books and records instead
13 of --

14 THE COURT: Okay. Let me advise you
15 all. You did exactly what the rule -- you stood on
16 what you did and you will live on what you did. Books
17 and records -- what people are admonished to do is to
18 seek books and records before they file litigation.
19 You can't file an initial complaint, then use books
20 and records to get discovery.

21 So you've got a complaint before me.
22 You chose to stand on it. Stand on it. If you've got
23 issues with yourself and your legal judgment and those
24 of your Delaware counsel or prior Delaware counsel,

1 that's all in your sacred sweat lodge on your side of
2 the equation. I don't want to hear about it, okay?
3 You had an opportunity in response to this to file an
4 amended complaint. You did not. So let's focus on
5 what's in your complaint.

6 MR. OBERLANDER: All right. But just
7 for the record, I wasn't intending to use books and
8 records as discovery. Books -- I just wanted to be
9 clear. Books and records -- since it's filed and been
10 in front of you already, just for books and records
11 runs to the new charges and a new complaint that --

12 THE COURT: But the point is, once
13 you're in litigation, if you want information for an
14 amendment, you need to either get it through discovery
15 or you need to plead and plead the gateway. That is
16 the way it works. It's a sequential thing. What
17 people who are stockholders are encouraged to do is
18 use their books and records right before they file a
19 litigation. Once you file a litigation, you can't go
20 around under 220 or an LLC statute equivalent and seek
21 stuff to buttress your complaint. And Rule 15(aaa) is
22 clear. It's emphatically clear.

23 MR. OBERLANDER: It was my
24 understanding that Rule 15(aaa) says that once they

1 file a responsive pleading, you no longer have the
2 right to amend. You have to petition for leave to
3 amend. Or is that 15(aa), if you forgive me? But
4 that --

5 THE COURT: No. What 15(aaa) clearly
6 says is if you want to defeat a motion to dismiss,
7 you're supposed to bring forward your amendment.

8 MR. OBERLANDER: Granted, if you --

9 THE COURT: If you wish to defeat --

10 MR. OBERLANDER: If you wish to defeat
11 it by an amendment.

12 THE COURT: By an amendment.

13 MR. OBERLANDER: Yes.

14 THE COURT: So you don't have your
15 amendment. So you're standing on your complaint.

16 MR. OBERLANDER: All right. As to
17 personal jurisdiction and conspiracy theory, all
18 right, the -- there has been an affidavit filed in
19 connection with the reply brief alleging acts
20 occurring both in 2005 and 2007 which support
21 conspiracy jurisdiction. And once conspiracy
22 jurisdiction is established over all of the named
23 defendants, then while they may or may not be
24 necessary, none of them can be indispensable, because

1 by definition they would all be subject to
2 jurisdiction.

3 THE COURT: Where in the complaint
4 is -- your -- your pleading in your complaint is that
5 from the get-go no one intended to honor this
6 contract; right?

7 MR. OBERLANDER: No. I'm sorry. I
8 was going to get to that. What my --

9 THE COURT: So that's not in your
10 complaint. So I -- I didn't read --

11 MR. OBERLANDER: The way you phrased
12 it, I would have to say no. I'm not being
13 pettifogging here. The way you phrased it, I would
14 disagree. That isn't my complaint. I'm -- I --

15 THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph 57. "at
16 the time of their execution of that contract" -- this
17 would be the November 10 contract -- "each and every
18 one of ... the Company; and ... the Company Entities;
19 had a secret intention never to honor those
20 obligations."

21 MR. OBERLANDER: But -- but, Your
22 Honor, in the entire context of a complaint, I don't
23 believe -- I won't argue that it couldn't have be
24 written more clearly, but the complaint does state --

1 and I can state you the paragraph numbers to support
2 the following: Here's what -- here's how that
3 complaint is structured.

4 THE COURT: Paragraph 71: "Secretly
5 (and therefore unknown to Kriss), each and every one
6 of the sellers never intended to honor the rights
7 conveyed to Kriss by those securities"

8 MR. OBERLANDER: Absolutely. But what
9 we're -- but there's a huge distinction here, a very
10 big distinction that -- that counsel for defendants
11 has glossed over, which is that there are -- to make
12 it simple, there are two separate contracts at issue
13 here. There are actually 19 of them, but let's just
14 take two, one from the group of 18 and that agreement.

15 What we have here is the equivalent of
16 a TowerHill situation whereby --

17 THE COURT: Will you stick to this
18 case and stick to your complaint?

19 MR. OBERLANDER: The complaint says
20 that we signed the contract -- my client signed the
21 contract with them in which they said "We are now
22 giving you membership interests in 18 limited" --
23 well, "in all the limited liability companies known as
24 the company entities. We're giving you right now

1 membership interest in them."

2 The complaint then says we're suing
3 those companies issuing those interests because some
4 of those companies absolutely did issue the interest
5 but intended, after issuing them, never to honor the
6 obligations conveyed by those interests. And the
7 obligations conveyed by those interests are running
8 through the limited liability company agreements of
9 those companies.

10 What we have here is Mr. Kriss signed
11 a subscription agreement, except he provided services
12 instead of money; but in return for that he was given
13 stock in some number of company entities. Out of that
14 number a subset -- it was completely effective. He
15 got the stock, but we claim that the companies giving
16 him the stock intended never to honor the dividend
17 rights. Now, since it's an LLC, we'll say they gave
18 him membership interests, intending never to honor any
19 of the rights and obligations, including
20 distributions, but it would be the same concept.

21 So what that complaint doesn't say,
22 when Bayrock, the parent company, entered into this
23 contract, it had a secret conspiracy with its managers
24 and with its 18 controlled subsidiary-related

1 companies. And pursuant to that conspiracy, it would
2 cause all 18 of them to issue stock to him, but the 18
3 of them would then -- excuse me; membership interest,
4 but the 18 would then, although he would now be bound
5 by their limited liability company agreements, the 18
6 of them would never honor them.

7 Now, at the time we assumed, because
8 of evidence that we would produce at trial, we assumed
9 that some of the 18, they legally ineffectively
10 couldn't actually make the transfer of interest
11 because they didn't have the power and some they did.
12 That complaint has been misrepresented.

13 Counsel in their opening brief in
14 support of the motion to dismiss says that we have
15 alleged in paragraph 39 that the document -- that the
16 November 10th subscription agreement, employment
17 agreement, ~~call it what you will~~, they say that in
18 paragraph 39 we claim it was legally ineffective as to
19 convey membership interests in any of the other
20 companies. That is absolutely not the case.

21 What happened is, I was advised we
22 cannot do fictitious pleading in Delaware. So
23 paragraph 39 of that complaint says that there is a
24 group of companies, a subset of company entities --

1 and we will call that subset Class A. As to those,
2 they had no power to convey the membership interests
3 and, therefore, perpetrated a fraud, and those
4 companies participated in the fraud along with
5 Bayrock.

6 As to all the other companies not in
7 Class A, they had the right, did give him -- and if
8 you look at paragraphs 108 and 110, I believe, you
9 will see that we affirmatively allege as to Bayrock
10 Whitestone and as to Bayrock Spring Street that he was
11 instantly made a member of them. And that's why there
12 are derivative pleadings based on them.

13 So when Your Honor said to me are we
14 basically saying the November 10th contract was
15 intended not to be honored, the answer is absolutely
16 not. Not only that, we are simply -- everything we
17 are doing in this Court -- that we intend to do in
18 this Court and that we want to do in this Court
19 relates to claims of breaches of the limited liability
20 company agreements and not of that November 10th
21 contract. That's why I cite to Parfi, to TowerHill,
22 to all of the cases involving dueling contracts.

23 This case is about -- and secondly --
24 if you will forgive me, let me backtrack. Secondly,

1 counsel for defendant has said that we are making a
2 claim for distributions we didn't get. I'd appreciate
3 counsel showing me where in that complaint it is,
4 because under no circumstances does that complaint say
5 anything about distributions that he should have
6 gotten and didn't get. We didn't make that complaint
7 in that -- there's no claim for such a thing in there.

8 THE COURT: Well, you say -- what do
9 you mean by "cheated out of millions of dollars"?

10 MR. OBERLANDER: Well, that's -- so
11 it's in terrorem. It's part of the text of pleading,
12 but there's no claim. There's claims for various -- I
13 didn't make a claim for money damages for
14 distributions he didn't get. She said I did. I
15 didn't. There is no claim saying as a result of X,
16 when X happened, he should have got a distribution of
17 Y. That's just not in the complaint.

18 THE COURT: Right. The fact that you
19 have an extraordinarily vague complaint and you're
20 seeking to take advantage of it? You have a prayer
21 for relief including without limited -- limitation
22 money damages.

23 MR. OBERLANDER: Well, this is a court
24 of equity. And while I did ask for money damages, I

1 also asked -- pled in the alternative --

2 THE COURT: That isn't what you just
3 said. You said it was unfair for your adversary to
4 indicate that one of your beefs was withheld
5 distributions, even though in the complaint you
6 specifically say -- you refer to millions of dollars
7 that your client supposedly didn't get. Then you ask
8 for money damages.

9 MR. OBERLANDER: But it's pled with
10 absolute -- the pleadings, the pleadings -- and she
11 didn't object to failure to -- I don't see any motion
12 to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action.

13 THE COURT: It's not the point. You
14 just said that your complaint was mischaracterized by
15 the -- indicating that somehow it encompassed a claim
16 for lack of receiving distributions or something like
17 that.

18 MR. OBERLANDER: A claim for
19 distributions due and not paid pursuant to a limited
20 liability company agreement would be a direct cause of
21 action for breach of the limited liability company
22 agreement. And I don't have such a claim in there.

23 What I claimed in there --

24 THE COURT: I'm sure that's helpful

1 for counsel to know.

2 MR. OBERLANDER: But I didn't claim
3 for it.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. OBERLANDER: All right?

6 THE COURT: I would have thought when
7 you complained that you lost -- your client didn't
8 access to millions of dollars and sought money damages
9 and was saying that he --

10 MR. OBERLANDER: I understand that as
11 a matter of notice pleading that one could assume that
12 that's the beef; but, in fact, no -- no facts are
13 alleged in there, really, that took place after 2005.
14 That complaint is limited to facts that occurred in
15 2005 other than for background it explains that yes,
16 later on, he would wind up being cheated of millions.

17 But, in fact, the amount of damages
18 based on the theory of fraudulent inducement or
19 restitution or whatever you want -- the amount of
20 damages that complaint would provide, if it went into
21 trial and went into judgment, the measure of damages
22 that the complaint would allow would be what -- for
23 example, under one theory, what is it which, had he
24 been given the interest that he couldn't have been

1 given because the Class A companies had no right to
2 give it to him, what would he have received. So he
3 was cheated out of millions of dollars from the Class
4 A companies because they said "Here. Here's your
5 stock in Class A companies." They knew darn well that
6 they had no right to give it to him, that the
7 conveyance is ineffective; but had it been effective,
8 he would have had millions of dividends flowing
9 through the stock.

10 In the LLC context, "Here are your
11 membership interests in six Class A companies." Two
12 years later they're ready to pay off; but the answer
13 is nope, not to him, because they were ineffectually
14 transferred.

15 So I can say that he was cheated out
16 of millions of dollars, but it doesn't mean that out
17 of distributions. It means money -- there are
18 multiple theories by which he lost money that can be
19 compensable, none of which run to distributions.

20 But the bigger --

21 THE COURT: Well, that's -- that's
22 good. I'm glad that you've clarified that for
23 everybody so that people could know what you were
24 thinking when you said this.

1 MR. OBERLANDER: Well, I made at least
2 eight separate attempts to talk to opposing counsel
3 during the last several months. And it might have
4 come up had they been willing to talk; but we got
5 basically "Go away. We don't want to talk to you"
6 comments from them at all times.

7 When you asked her "Did you ever speak
8 to him" -- I believe you asked counsel whether or not
9 they ever spoke with us about the amended complaint.
10 No, because they wouldn't simply speak with us. Don't
11 answer phone calls. My colleague there will explain
12 more, because he made more of the phone calls than I
13 did. In fact, I only called once yesterday, and I
14 think everything else was e-mail. I don't want to be
15 misquoted.

16 But if Your Honor would please look at
17 paragraph 39 of my complaint, paragraph 39 makes it
18 very clear that we are saying "There is a class of
19 companies in which you said" -- "you're giving him
20 stock and you legally couldn't do it, and you knew
21 that."

22 Now, it doesn't say it was ineffective
23 as to all the companies. There are companies for
24 which the transfers were effective. Those are the

1 ones not in Class A; but specifically alleged in there
2 in 108 and 110 are that two companies, Whitestone
3 and -- Whitestone and Spring Street, that it was
4 effective, and he became a member on November 10th.

5 Now, Mr. Arif filed a sworn affidavit
6 in support of the opening brief for the motion to
7 dismiss. And in that affidavit he says that he did
8 give -- or he caused these companies to give interests
9 to Kriss, and he said some of the company entities
10 were formed in Delaware; but other than that, nobody
11 on this group ever had anything to do with Delaware.

12 So if he's in here stating under oath
13 that "We formed some company entities in Delaware and,
14 No. 2, that's all we ever did in Delaware," then it
15 should be obvious logistically that every company they
16 formed in Delaware is a company entity. Whitestone
17 was formed in Delaware, and Spring Street was formed
18 in Delaware. So as far as we're concerned, they've
19 now admitted as fact that Spring Street and Whitestone
20 are company entities.

21 Now, we actually alleged in the
22 complaint that they're company entities. And in the
23 answer that they filed two days after their motion to
24 dismiss so that we couldn't file an amended complaint

1 at the time, which is why it didn't get done with
2 prior counsel, what happened is that they filed a
3 motion to dismiss. And then we said "Now, gee, why
4 did you do that? We're still going to file an amended
5 complaint." And it may be that there was a lot of
6 work done for nothing. And he wrote back,
7 Mr. Willoughby, "Well, no, you can't do that because
8 under 15(aaa) we filed a responsive pleading."

9 And my counsel at the time wrote back
10 and said "That's news to us. Please enlighten us why
11 a motion to dismiss is a responsive pleading."

12 So two days later they filed a
13 perfunctory -- you talk about perfunctory -- they
14 filed a perfunctory answer. There's no reason they
15 filed that answer other than to stop me from being
16 able to file an amended complaint without leave.

17 But --

18 THE COURT: They filed an answer?

19 MR. OBERLANDER: Yes. They filed an
20 answer two days after the motion to dismiss. And if
21 you look at the e-mail trails that are in our reply
22 brief, you will see that it was specifically done just
23 to stop me from filing an amended complaint as of
24 right. They filed a motion to dismiss on May 13th, I

1 think, and then on May 16th filed an answer.

2 But if I may, you know, and standing
3 on this complaint, I would be perfectly willing to do
4 the following: I will be -- first of all, in their --
5 in their reply brief -- I'm sorry.

6 In their reply brief they
7 affirmatively allege that they did transfer the
8 interests in all company entities. That's in there.
9 It specifically says in order to effectuate the
10 profits' interest in the Bayrock enterprise or
11 whatever you want to call them, in order to effectuate
12 them, the limited liability company agreements of all
13 of the company entities were modified and amended to
14 incorporate the provisions of Section 4. That's a
15 paraphrase of three consecutive sentences.

16 Since they allege that all the company
17 entities were properly modified as to their limited
18 liability agreements, we stipulate to that. We
19 withdraw the entire Class A section of the complaint;
20 and, therefore, we stipulate to their allegation that
21 all of the limited liability company agreements of all
22 of the company entities were, indeed, amended. And
23 every cause of action with which we wish to proceed is
24 for breach of those limited liability company

1 agreements, absolutely none of which have arbitration
2 provisions in them. And in their own argument they
3 say -- in their own opening brief they say that
4 Section 4, which has -- of the employment agreement,
5 which has to do with the rights of the membership
6 interests, that section and no other section was
7 incorporated into those LLC agreements. We now
8 stipulate to that and agree that the LLC agreements of
9 every single company entity were modified on
10 November 10th to incorporate exactly Section 4 and no
11 other section.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
13 Tell me about this answer.

14 MS. McCORMICK: We filed an answer in
15 May, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Why didn't you say that
17 when I asked you about this thing about the amended
18 complaint?

19 MS. McCORMICK: We understand -- first
20 of all, it's our understanding, Your Honor, that
21 filing an answer does not preclude a party from
22 seeking leave to file an amended complaint. We don't
23 know why they haven't filed the motion for leave to
24 file an amended complaint. And that was the nature of

1 my response to Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: So you were just trying to
3 do it so that they wouldn't necessarily be able to
4 file a motion with leave as of right?

5 MS. McCORMICK: Right. Your Honor we
6 wanted to preserve our opportunity to oppose the
7 motion for leave to file an amended complaint. We
8 wanted the opportunity to review the complaint and,
9 based on the same frivolity that they filed their
10 initial complaint, argue to Your Honor, you know, on
11 the basis that you can oppose the filing of an amended
12 complaint.

13 THE COURT: Thank you.

14 MS. McCORMICK: It's our
15 understanding, Your Honor, that even if you assume
16 everything that -- that counsel for plaintiff has
17 stated with respect to what he intended when he
18 drafted the complaint to be true, even if you assume
19 all of those things, that you still can't escape the
20 November 10th contract's arbitration clause, because
21 the issue of standing is still contested and because
22 that clause itself governs substantive rights with
23 respect to any of the company entities it purportedly
24 vests membership interests in.

1 And the reason for that is, in the
2 contract itself, which Your Honor was provided a copy
3 of in the form of Exhibit A to our opening brief, the
4 contract states that plaintiff is entitled to certain
5 advancements immediately and separately and later he
6 would be vested with membership interests, and any
7 distributions in the interests in those entities that
8 he was entitled to would be counted against any
9 advancement he had received.

10 So the issue of what money plaintiff
11 would ultimately be owed in any of those entities
12 cannot be considered without looking at the
13 November 10th contract.

14 And even if it wasn't pled that that
15 is a breach of action, it's our understanding that
16 that would factor into any award this Court was to
17 give Mr. Kriss, if any at all.

18 It's for that reason that we say that
19 the arbitration clause cannot be avoided.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. McCORMICK: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: No.

23 MR. OBERLANDER: No? I'm sorry?

24 THE COURT: I ... We're not doing sur

1 replies here today.

2 I have to say, this is an astonishing
3 circumstance for many reasons. But I'm going to give
4 you my ruling. Then I'll give you some advice.

5 It may well be at the bottom of this
6 that some serious wrong has been done to Mr. Kriss. I
7 have no idea. What I do know is that there are
8 multiple reasons why this -- the complaint before me
9 needs to be dismissed. Start with the first reason
10 that the other side advances, which is the arbitration
11 clause. A reading of the complaint brings everything
12 back to the November 10th agreement. The complaint
13 itself alleges that the company entities are parties
14 to that agreement. That agreement has a broad
15 arbitration clause. Rather than grapple with the
16 governing law, the plaintiffs cited Delaware law,
17 which is inapplicable. Frankly, the Delaware law that
18 they cited doesn't help them.

19 After the Willie Gary decision of the
20 Delaware Supreme Court, it's been very clear that when
21 parties incorporate the AAA rules, they reverse the
22 presumption that arbitrability is for the -- for the
23 Court and it is for the arbitrator. In the McLaughlin
24 decision reported at 942 A. 2d 616 -- and I believe

1 it's the Carder -- I think it's C-a-r-d-e-r. I think
2 it's the decision of Vice Chancellor Parsons just
3 issued within the week -- it's made emphatically clear
4 that if there's any colorable dispute about
5 arbitrability in the event of the incorporation of the
6 AAA rules, that dispute is decided by the arbitrator.
7 Our Supreme Court made very clear in Willie Gary that
8 it was adopting the federal majority view, and that is
9 an efficiency-based view.

10 The point is not that arbitrability
11 goes only to the arbitrator when there's no dispute
12 about arbitrability. That's a silly rule. The idea
13 is, in the event that there's a dispute about
14 arbitrability, who makes the call. Willie Gary says
15 when you incorporate the AAA rules, it's the
16 arbitrator, except in some unusual circumstances.

17 New York is even more powerful, and
18 that's what matters here. Willie Gary and Delaware,
19 Parfi, TowerHill, memories of mine, are irrelevant,
20 irrelevant. The contract at issue here is a New York
21 law contract, specifically New York law without regard
22 to choice of law. The issue of arbitrability is then
23 one of New York law.

24 The New York cases are clear. They

1 adopt the federal majority standard. When you pick
2 AAA, arbitrability is for the arbitrator. Here, you
3 have a broad arbitration clause which in court --
4 keeping with the New York authority, which was cited
5 in the defendants' briefs and cited accurately -- if
6 you have a broad arbitration clause -- and this is a
7 broad arbitration clause -- and you incorporate the
8 AAA rules, there's clear and unmistakable evidence
9 that arbitrability is for the arbitrator.

10 There is some quibbles about
11 arbitrability made by the plaintiffs. One of them
12 relates to a clause which does have some -- some color
13 to the argument, which is this idea about who is --
14 who has to arbitrate. They have an argument about how
15 it's read. There's another reasonable way to read it,
16 however. And that's the point. Which is if -- there
17 may be certain nonsignatories you don't have to
18 arbitrate against, but there are doctrines in law,
19 well-recognized in New York and federal law, in which
20 signatories are bound to arbitrate against
21 nonsignatories.

22 The key issue -- and it is the central
23 issue -- I don't make that call. The arbitrator does.
24 And if you don't like what the arbitrator says, then

1 you appeal under the FAA.

2 What we clearly have is a signatory to
3 a broad arbitration provision who is seeking --
4 frankly, there's no excuse for evading the clause as
5 to the company entities or the parties that you
6 concede are signatories, none. None pled.

7 Clearly also on the -- if you want to
8 get into the merits of stuff, arbitrability, but it
9 goes to the colorability -- what I'll say is the clear
10 colorable claim that there's -- that all these claims
11 are arbitrable. The complaint itself links everything
12 to the agreement. Mr. Kriss was supposed to provide
13 certain services under the agreement. In exchange he
14 got certain rights, rights in these LLCs, which were
15 denied to him.

16 Despite counsel's -- counsel may want
17 to say that there were certain things given; for
18 example, that he got his interests in certain of the
19 LLCs. Well, his pleading, the pleading is
20 emphatically clear that Mr. Kriss was denied his
21 rights under these agreements on a continuing basis.
22 And it is alleged that the defendants never intended
23 to honor the contract rights, such that it is alleged
24 that they breached the contracts, they breached the

1 November 10th contract, and there's even an implied
2 covenant claim under those contracts. It's also made
3 plain that the contract rights are intertwined with
4 the receipt rights. He was supposed to get money in
5 certain phases and other sorts of things. It's a
6 complicated arrangement.

7 There's also an evident reason why you
8 use an arbitration clause with respect to a
9 multiplicity of entities incorporated or domiciled, as
10 the case may be, since they're not necessarily
11 corporations, in different jurisdictions. So that
12 everybody could come together, which is why Mr. Kriss
13 alleges that the company entities are, in fact,
14 parties to the agreement. People could read it
15 otherwise, but his allegation is that they are parties
16 to the agreement. And his contractual promise, if he
17 had a dispute about it or relating to his agreement,
18 that he would arbitrate that.

19 All of which is -- in terms of getting
20 to the merits of substantive arbitrability, I'm not
21 making a call on that, because it is chosen by the
22 parties that the arbitrator does it.

23 Alternatively, there's another basis
24 to dismiss it. This complaint does not plead any

1 viable basis for jurisdiction over the nonresident
2 defendants. To the extent that there are some
3 Delaware entities involved, they preexisted in the
4 complaint, they preexisted the contract. All that
5 Mr. Kriss says is that among the company entities were
6 certain Delaware entities, and he was supposed to get
7 interest in those. Well, among the many of the
8 entities were Florida entities. He was supposed to
9 get entities in -- he was supposed to get interest in
10 them. Those entities preexisted this contract. They
11 weren't formed. And this complaint doesn't plead
12 anything about later events. I'll get to some of the,
13 you know, musings about what might be in an amended
14 complaint some day; but this complaint pleads none,
15 nothing.

16 Also, what it doesn't do is identify
17 really anything except ~~it says that Mrs.~~ -- you know,
18 Mrs. ... is it Sharif? Arif was in cahoots, the
19 accountant was in cahoots, the lawyer was in cahoots.
20 Doesn't tie anything to any act in Delaware.

21 The thing that was used was the
22 long-arm statute. I'm extremely well-versed in it.
23 I'm happy -- I contributed to the jurisprudence to
24 this state on many times about 3104 and the agency

1 theory and how it works in concert. You have to have
2 an act in Delaware. None -- and it has to be a
3 substantial act in furtherance of conspiracy. Nothing
4 like that is pled.

5 And, in fact, I think constitutionally
6 here, the exercise of jurisdiction is highly suspect.
7 Usually when someone tries to invoke the conspiracy
8 theory of jurisdiction, it's because there's been an
9 act, formation of a Delaware entity or something in a
10 transaction where Delaware law is the focus of what's
11 going on.

12 What's astonishing here is the
13 invocation of this Court's forum -- the forum of this
14 state in a case that's so redolent of the Gotham
15 state. Sorry. This is New York, New York, New York.
16 And you read in the complaint Mr. Kriss, is he a
17 Delawarean? No. He resides in New York. In fact,
18 his address under the contract is 75th Street.
19 Bayrock Group, the key central entity, New York
20 limited liability company with its principal place of
21 business in New York. Mr. Arif, identified as a
22 Turkish national residing in New York. Sater, a
23 resident of New York. Schwarz, he's in New Jersey, I
24 suspect the part of New Jersey closer to New York than

1 to Delaware, because what? He's an attorney licensed
2 in New York and represents Bayrock. Dogan &
3 Associates, law firm, principal office, New York.
4 Dogan, attorney licensed to practice in New York.
5 Salomon, New York professional corporation. Alex
6 Salomon, CPA, New York. Bencivenga, CPA, New York.
7 Mrs. Sater -- Sater, Arif's -- is the wife of Sater.
8 I suppose she lives with her husband in New York.

9 If you look at the company entities,
10 their principal places of business, even the Florida
11 and Delaware entities, the principal place, a business
12 of all of them is -- where it's identified is New
13 York. The contractual choice of law is New York.

14 So this contract is all about New
15 York. All of the rights that go forward are linked
16 into the contract. And I don't know how it would give
17 anybody a reasonable basis, if I were in New York
18 entering into a New York law contract as to the fact
19 that there was some interest given in preexisting
20 Florida and Delaware entities, how I would know that I
21 would be hauled in to court on this complaint. I
22 don't believe it's -- it's constitutionally fair
23 notice, and there's no proper statutory basis for
24 service.

1 Given that, these are clearly
2 indispensable parties. One of the reasons why, again,
3 people do dispute resolution clauses like arbitration
4 clauses, when you have people in different places, is
5 to bring them altogether. There are Florida law
6 entities here. There are entity -- there are people
7 who live exclusively in New York.

8 I also say the complaint is wholly
9 devoid of specific evidence of involvement of these
10 people. Basically just throwing professionals into
11 the mix by saying there is one contract -- there is
12 one paragraph that I guess gets a little bit more
13 specific. There's some -- "November ... 2005 ..."
14 communications between Issuers and their counsel and
15 such other persons and ... Salomon ... in which they
16 [were] warned of the absence of such authority"; but
17 they "[weren't] known to Kriss at that time."

18 That's about it. Most of the stuff is
19 very vague, and it certainly doesn't -- if you -- if
20 you have a fraud standard under Rule 9 and you want to
21 use the agency theory of jurisdiction, there's nothing
22 linking these people to any formative activity.

23 So arbitration under New York law,
24 established New York law in this context is for the

1 arbitrator. Alternatively, there's no personal
2 jurisdiction pled for the nonresident defendants,
3 either, as a matter of statutory law or constitutional
4 due process. And in the absence -- and -- and there
5 are also -- this Court also, therefore, would not be
6 able to have indispensable parties.

7 Now, let's talk about going forward.
8 I am going to dismiss this without prejudice through
9 the institution of a complaint in New York if the
10 arbitrator determines that there are claims that
11 aren't arbitrable. It is with prejudice as to any
12 filing in this Court.

13 I make that judgment -- I -- I don't
14 necessarily applaud what the defendants did with
15 respect to filing an answer, but it did not preclude
16 the plaintiffs from seeking to amend. And the
17 plaintiffs, if they wish to amend, should have
18 amended. There's a sprawling, complicated,
19 difficult-to-follow recitation in an answering brief
20 of some new theory. I don't believe it's actually
21 that distinct from the old theory. I think the old
22 theory was "We basically told this guy he would get
23 interest in these things." The contract spelled out
24 what those interests were and how it worked with his

1 draw and other kinds of stuff. And they never really
2 intended to honor it. And certainly when things went
3 well, they didn't.

4 And then there's some example in this
5 new thing of how -- you know, the point is that some
6 of the entities may have actually given him a
7 membership interest. I don't know. It's hard to tell
8 whether anybody got any certificates or anything
9 noticing an interest or anything from what's pled. I
10 mean, it's not -- "pled" is the wrong word. Not
11 "pled"; put in a brief.

12 Why you put in an amended complaint
13 and why AAA is the way it is, so that you can take
14 your shot. If you don't like the first shot you did
15 when they compiled their motion to dismiss, they give
16 you -- in their brief they give you what their
17 concerns are. You have the chance to obviate, you
18 know, those concerns and to address them by bringing
19 forth a new pleading. You don't get the chance to say
20 in your brief what a pleading might look like.

21 Honestly, counsel sitting there
22 telling me that the other side was supposed to
23 interpolate what he meant by his pursuit of monetary
24 damages, what he meant by his accusation that

1 obligations owed to Mr. Kriss allegedly under the
2 November 10th agreement, that -- remember, under the
3 November 10th agreement -- and this is why the
4 arbitrability point is colorable -- those -- that
5 contract said you get certain rights in entities and
6 entities would do certain things to give Mr. Kriss
7 rights. Well, how anyone's supposed to know, when the
8 complaint refers to -- refers to millions of dollars
9 that he was not given and seeks monetary damages that
10 somehow in this first complaint it wasn't dealing with
11 distributions he was denied; only some other category?
12 Who's supposed to know that? Most plaintiffs would
13 stand up and say "Of course it encompassed all the
14 elements of denial." Now it's "Oh, no. We were
15 waiting for later to bring that on."

16 This kind of guessing game is not
17 going to be useful to Mr. Kriss going on or to any
18 tribunal trying to make sense of this. And you have
19 your shot to bring an amended complaint. You didn't
20 use it. I could dismiss it with prejudice entirely in
21 some ways, but I'm -- the condition is going to be,
22 you can take your shot in New York if you're going to
23 bring another case back in court, but not here.

24 And I will also say in terms of --

1 this forum non conveniens is not easy to establish in
2 Delaware; but if there's -- this is the kind of case
3 where I believe our Supreme Court would be highly
4 sensitive to inclination of this Court to grant a
5 motion to dismiss for lack of proper forum.

6 Why do I say that? Well, what -- why
7 we usually give credence to plaintiffs is because our
8 state has some real nexus to what's going on. Our law
9 is really at stake, for example, in the business
10 context. That is not what is going on here.

11 The root of the wrong pled is that
12 Mr. Kriss was contractually promised interest in a --
13 in a real estate empire that operated through multiple
14 entities, and then from the get-go the intention of
15 the people who lured him in to give his services was
16 to not honor that promise. The holding company,
17 ultimate holding company is a New York company. The
18 core contract is a New York law contract. Mr. Kriss
19 is a New Yorker. The people he dealt with were New
20 Yorkers. He dealt with them in New York. The fact
21 that some of the subs were in Delaware really doesn't
22 drive the analysis.

23 They are also in Florida. We have
24 blue crabs. They do that stone crab thing. I don't

1 really understand it. New Yorkers do oysters. And --
2 but the point is, Delaware doesn't have much to do
3 with this.

4 And then I hear that in the
5 unspecified amended complaint there's going to be a
6 holy host of others joining us. Well, there's one
7 state where it's very obvious the parties centered
8 their activity, where all the defendants -- there's
9 not one defendant in here, if it's not arbitrable, who
10 can't be subject to service in New York, not one.
11 From what's pled, all the Delaware entities and all
12 the Florida entities had their principal place of
13 business in New York. The accountants practice in New
14 York. The lawyer practices in New York. The wife's
15 in New York.

16 The law at issue is going to be New
17 York. The fraud law is New York. The contract law,
18 the tort law, it's all New York. Entity -- what we're
19 going to do is say a subsidiary -- some subsidiary
20 denied Mr. Kriss rights? That's not even the theory;
21 right? The theory is that these were subs to shells
22 of the holding company, right, and that the dude who
23 controlled the holding company, Arif, made all the
24 decisions. That's the theory.

1 The holding company is a New York
2 company. The contract that gave Mr. Kriss rights in
3 any of these entities is a, by its express terms, a
4 New York contract.

5 So I want you all to work on
6 scrivening the thing. You need to take your shot in
7 arbitration. And if you -- if it doesn't go in New
8 York -- arbitration, you can file in New York; but
9 this case is going to be dismissed in total, because
10 the reasoning for it applies, frankly, to the
11 defendant who has not moved. And I'm sorry if there
12 were misunderstandings with counsel. I don't know
13 what that's about, I really don't. I don't understand
14 how anybody reasonably could read the rules of this
15 Court or the procedural context that this is in, even
16 given the filing of an answer, and not know that if
17 you wish to bring on an amended complaint, you do it.

18 But one of the things here is, there's
19 absolutely no explanation for why the arbitration
20 clause doesn't apply against Mr. Arif, why it doesn't
21 apply against the company entities as to the core
22 issue pled in this complaint, which is clearly a
23 breach of contract action. Also, all the other
24 things, clearly there's a colorable argument that

1 they're related and swept in by the arbitration
2 clause.

3 So with respect to the signatory
4 versus signatory issues, there's absolutely no
5 explanation of why those are not in arbitration. And
6 so I really don't get why, you know, we got to where
7 we are. But I'm not, frankly, doing Mr. Kriss any
8 favors. He's pled substantial claims on the merits.
9 If this is real, there's some -- and I have confidence
10 the New York courts or the arbitrator will be
11 sensitive to them.

12 But there are choices in life you
13 make about where, you know, things are filed. And you
14 have to respect that. And that's what I'm saying.
15 This action -- or in New York, if I were keeping this
16 action, this action would be immediately stayed until
17 the arbitration is completed, even if there was
18 nonarbitrable claims. Why? It's pretty obvious, that
19 the core issue here of whether there was a breach of
20 the -- of the 2005 agreement, whether that was
21 fraudulently induced, whether there was anything, is
22 central and ought to be determined first and that
23 there's a risk of inconsistent judgments. Most -- a
24 lot of the individuals brought here are essentially

1 aiding and abetting the primary things.

2 I won't even comment on -- I don't
3 believe -- nobody attacked this. I also don't believe
4 that the Arizona or Delaware securities laws apply
5 every time a share of stock or an interest in a
6 Delaware or an Arizona entity is sold. It would be
7 astonish -- I mean, we could, you know -- Eliot
8 Spitzer could look like a piker in comparison to our
9 Attorney General, then. I had actually thought -- you
10 talk about sales of securities within the borders of
11 states when you're talking about blue sky laws, you
12 know, because essentially every time a Delaware -- you
13 know, General Motors stock was sold anywhere, you
14 could, you know -- maybe that's the case and our blue
15 sky laws apply. I just hadn't heard that before. I
16 would think New York, right --

17 MR. OBERLANDER: We don't have any.

18 THE COURT: Well ... you don't have
19 any. You don't have any securities laws? I mean ...

20 MR. OBERLANDER: Not for private
21 rights of action.

22 THE COURT: Okay. But it just seems
23 really odd.

24 And so I probably said too much. But

1 I want to -- I respect the fact that there are serious
2 concerns here by -- that Mr. Kriss has. I think,
3 honestly, take -- take these words to heart. And I
4 think if you do, you can be getting on with the merits
5 in arbitration of pursuing your claims or certainly
6 have the fight about arbitrability and then see what
7 comes out of that.

8 But in any event, what ought to come
9 out of it is that this case ought to proceed either --
10 as to the signatories, it seems pretty clear the
11 arbitrator is going to make you go at least forward
12 with some of the claims in arbitration or you're going
13 to have to renounce those claims in some binding way.
14 And then with respect to the rest, it all happened in
15 New York. And I don't see any reason why it makes any
16 sense to be here, honestly, given that -- it would be
17 ~~one thing if this was~~ -- Delaware law was the focus
18 and was critical and where all the entities were.
19 It's quite to the contrary. There's one place -- and
20 I love that place. I'm a big New York -- fan of New
21 York. And so, you know, it's -- it's a great -- it's
22 a great state.

23 And so get -- confirm -- confer with
24 each other. Get in a simple order. I think the one

1 thing that will have to be nuanced is how you do the
2 interaction of the arbitration, because it really --
3 you ought to be going to arbitration. It could be
4 just as simple, again, without prejudice to filing in
5 New York. You may have to go -- if they file in New
6 York and they go around the arbitrator again, you may
7 have to get another ruling or something like that.
8 But I think what I would encourage is that you all
9 talk to each other. Come up with an order and move on
10 and -- because you're clearly going to move on and
11 have the fight somewhere. And I'm assuming that
12 that's what Mr. Kriss most wants is to get his remedy,
13 if he's entitled to one.

14 So I say please accept everything I
15 said in that spirit, because it's really meant in a
16 constructive spirit for all. I'd rather you
17 concentrate your resources on the central battle
18 rather than on where you're going to have it.

19 Thank you all.

20 MR. STAMOULIS: Your Honor, just one
21 question with regard to your ruling. Does it apply to
22 the books and records action that we filed yesterday
23 with regard to Mr. Kriss seeking access to books and
24 records on Spring Street and Whitestone, the two

1 Delaware companies? I just -- I don't want to be
2 pursuing an action in Delaware --

3 THE COURT: You filed a complaint
4 yesterday?

5 MR. STAMOULIS: Yes, Your Honor.
6 We -- we had served -- we -- we discussed going
7 forward with a books and records action.
8 Mr. Oberlander mentioned it during his presentation.
9 We served a demand on the Bayrock company for books
10 and records. They responded to the demand by saying
11 our purpose was improper and pretextual.

12 And -- and, Your Honor --

13 THE COURT: What I would do if I were
14 you, is, I would withdraw that complaint. I'm not
15 going to sit from the seat of my pants when I never
16 heard about that before.

17 What I will tell you is, I think if
18 you look at the law, once you put it in, once you put
19 it in play, which is by a complaint, you can't use
20 books and records, then, as discovery. And by
21 discovery, what I mean is buttressing your claim. You
22 chose to sue. If you think you have enough to sue
23 either in arbitration or whatever, then you should go
24 do it. And you have done it. And the fact that you

1 filed your complaint while this litigation is pending,
2 I mean, again, I'm not dismissing it from the seat of
3 my pants.

4 What I would suggest is, I would
5 withdraw it, if I were you. Rethink your strategy.
6 What -- you know, I don't -- I'm not being paid to be
7 your lawyer. But I would file the strongest darn
8 arbitration complaint I could. And I would seek the
9 best arbitrator I could under the AAA and an
10 experienced person and I'd get to fighting for the
11 remedy. But that's what you have to decide.
12 Having -- I had no idea -- I'm sure this got assigned
13 to me as a related case; right?

14 MR. STAMOULIS: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Yeah. And it's related in
16 the sense that you wanted books and records so you
17 could have discovery, you could have information that
18 you could use in this case.

19 MR. OBERLANDER: No. No. I'm sorry.

20 MR. STAMOULIS: My New York counsel
21 will answer that.

22 MR. OBERLANDER: Just for the
23 record -- and I have the utmost respect for books and
24 records proceedings -- Mr. Kriss filed a books and

1 records action for several proper purposes. I will
2 not argue that investigation of mismanagement, which
3 you will see in that complaint, the books and records
4 complaint, mind you, that cites activities in 2007 and
5 2005. You could fairly argue, Your Honor, and say
6 that that could certainly look like we were attempting
7 to use it for discovery. So I'm not going to argue
8 that that could look like that. Certainly that wasn't
9 our intent, but it could certainly look like.

10 But we have other proper purposes
11 stated. There is a very significant proper purpose in
12 the books and records which has nothing to do -- it
13 could be inconceivable to link it to that complaint,
14 which is that since they themselves have said in every
15 document they filed here that they gave him profits'
16 interests in company entities that made him a tax
17 partner, those company entities have transacted, to
18 our knowledge, \$87 million worth of sales, loans,
19 financings, and distributions; and he has never
20 received one K-1, nor will they provide any tax
21 returns or any other information. Tax returns are a
22 statutory item under 18-305. It's specifically
23 written requesting them, with very exquisitely
24 detailed explanation of why he needs them line by line

1 as a matter of partnership tax law, why he needs to
2 know why there are problems, inconsistent position
3 reports that have to be filed. And all of that,
4 obviously, relates to valuation.

5 So since they have already rejected
6 the books and records demand the same day we filed the
7 action claiming our action was pretextual, there isn't
8 one single thing anywhere in that complaint or in
9 anything we talked about to file later that relates to
10 taxes. His tax returns are absolutely -- not his;
11 partnership tax returns are clearly contemplated by
12 statute as absolutely a right to him. And in US v
13 Somerville or is it Somerville v US, in one of the
14 interim --

15 THE COURT: I told you --

16 MR. OBERLANDER: Okay.

17 THE COURT: -- I wasn't getting rid of
18 this. You've heard what I have to say. You make your
19 own judgment and I'll address it. If you want to
20 pursue a 220 action, you pursue it, and I'll handle it
21 in the ordinary course. Just be mindful of the
22 distinctions between 220 and Rule 26.

23 I'd also be mindful of -- I don't know
24 how much money in the world the parties have. But,

1 you know, sometimes you concentrate -- I mean,
2 sometimes wise people concentrate their resources.

3 But -- I appreciate you bringing it
4 up, but I have no idea. I don't monitor by the minute
5 what cases come in. So I'm focused on this particular
6 civil action.

7 So try to get me an implementing order
8 by next Tuesday at the latest. Thank you.

9 (Court adjourned at 11:03 a.m.)

10 - - -

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CERTIFICATE

I, NEITH D. ECKER, Official Court
Reporter for the Court of Chancery of the State of
Delaware, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages
numbered 3 through 55 contain a true and correct
transcription of the proceedings as stenographically
reported by me at the hearing in the above cause
before the Vice Chancellor of the State of Delaware,
on the date therein indicated.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set
my hand at Wilmington, this 18th day of September
2009.

/s/ Neith D. Ecker

Official Court Reporter-
of the Chancery Court
State of Delaware

Certificate Number: 113-PS
Expiration: Permanent

Joshua Bernstein

Page 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

- - - - - X

JOSHUA BERNSTEIN,

Plaintiff,

- against -

Index No:
02579/09

BAYROCK GROUP, LLC,

Defendant.

- - - - - X

11 Martine Avenue

White Plains, New York

March 8, 2010

10:04 a.m.

EXAMINATION BEFORE TRIAL OF
JOSHUA BERNSTEIN, the Plaintiff herein,
taken by an attorney for the Defendant,
pursuant to Notice and Order, held at the
above place and time before Apryl S.
Montero, a Stenotype Reporter and Notary
Public within and for the State of New
York.

* * * *

Joshua Bernstein

Page 194

1 A. Most do, yes.
2 Q. Did you ever take that hard
3 drive, download any of it for any reason
4 whatsoever?

5 MR. OBERLANDER: Compound
6 question. Objection.

7 Q. Did you ever take out that
8 hard drive physically?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Did you ever download
11 portions of the hard drive?

12 A. I believe so.

13 Q. Could you explain that when,
14 how, what did you download, for what
15 purpose?

16 A. At the direction of Felix
17 Satter I downloaded regularly files from
18 that hard drive and the server.

19 Q. What drives, what files?
20 Particular files or groups of files?

21 A. Groups, various.

22 Q. What directions did Felix
23 give you as far as --

24 A. To keep them offsite, an

Page 195

1 archival copy as much of the server as I
2 could. This was on or about December 17,
3 2007, I think well before, when he was
4 afraid that the firm was going to screw
5 him, that he wouldn't be able, you know,
6 to make his profits of his half of the
7 ownership of the firm.

8 Q. And did you follow his
9 instructions?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. So you downloaded files from
12 what computers or what servers?

13 A. There was only one active
14 server within the firm.

15 Q. What files?

16 A. Various e-mail files.

17 Q. Of whose?

18 A. Of various users.

19 Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you
20 about that in a couple of minutes. I
21 want to finish with this exhibit.

22 Please turn to page 11. Did
23 you receive an e-mail from Felix Satter
24 on September 8th saying, "Where are you?"

Page 196

1 It's September 8, 2008, on page 11?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And on page 12 did you
4 receive another one from him on
5 September 4th -- these may be -- I tried
6 to keep them chronological, but I see
7 that September 4th comes after September
8 8th. "Where are you?"

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So both on September 4th and
11 September 8th he, Felix, asked you where
12 you were?

13 A. Sure, which he would
14 regularly send to the employees who
15 worked for him, including Dan Ridloff,
16 and we'd correspond about where we were
17 at the time.

18 Q. And on September 4th on
19 page 13 he says, "Where are you? Answer
20 now."

21 Did you receive that?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Does that indicate to you
24 that he was impatient to hear from you?

Page 197

1 A. Yes, because I was sleeping
2 at this time.

3 Q. You were in Europe?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Let's go back to the --
6 THE WITNESS: Can I take a
7 break, a bathroom break.

8 MR. DOMB: Sure.

9 (Whereupon, a short recess
10 was taken.)

11 MR. DOMB: Let's mark the
12 next exhibit. I think it's a
13 multipage exhibit which I've
14 numbered 1 through 24.

15 MR. OBERLANDER: Off the
16 record.

17 (Whereupon, a discussion was
18 held off the record.)

19 (Whereupon, Defendant's
20 Exhibit S, a 24-page document, was
21 marked for identification as of
22 this date.)

23 Q. Exhibit S.

24 A. Yes.

50 (Pages 194 to 197)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 198

Page 200

1 Q. That is a composite exhibit
2 which consists of e-mails and maybe
3 e-mail attachments.

4 Did you sign the e-quote
5 with Greenhouse, that's the first page,
6 Greenhouse IT.

7 A. I believe that's my
8 signature.

9 Q. And that's July of '07;
10 there's a date right under your
11 signature?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And what were you
14 contracting to get from Greenhouse IT?

15 A. Software installation.

16 Q. What kind of software?

17 A. Spector CNE and configure
18 Trend anti-spyware.

19 Q. Can you explain in layman's
20 terms what that software does?

21 A. That's a monitoring
22 software.

23 Q. What does it enable you to
24 do?

Page 199

Page 201

1 A. It enables the administrator
2 to monitor activities on computers.

3 Q. Does it enable the
4 administrator to see what people are
5 seeing on their monitors and at their
6 workstation computers?

7 A. I believe that's a function
8 of it.

9 Q. Well, does that apply to,
10 let's say, web pages that they may be
11 looking at on the Internet?

12 A. I believe anything that's on
13 the screen.

14 Q. So it includes e-mails, for
15 example?

16 A. I believe anything that's on
17 the screen.

18 Q. And if you put up a contract
19 that would also be capable of being
20 monitored?

21 A. Anything on the screen.

22 Q. And who was the
23 administrator that could monitor this?

24 A. Felix Satter.

1 Q. Was he the only one?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Who else could?

4 A. I had the ability to as
5 well.

6 Q. You had the ability. Did
7 you actually monitor what people looked
8 at?

9 A. When asked by Felix, yes.

10 Q. Did you monitor when, on
11 your own, when not asked by Felix?

12 A. Not that I recall.

13 Q. But you had the ability to do
14 that?

15 A. Yes, given my administrative
16 rights, yes.

17 Q. When you signed up for this
18 software on line one it says on five
19 workstation, do you see that, the first
20 page?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And then if you look through
23 these e-mails you'll see that at some
24 point additional workstations were added;

1 correct?

2 A. I don't see that.

3 Q. Well, let's look at page 8,
4 at the bottom you e-mailed --

5 Simon Binder was from
6 Greenhouse; correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. You e-mailed Simon Binder,
9 and you said, "Here are five other
10 users -- "

11 And you gave initials;
12 correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Who is D. R.?

15 A. Dan Ridloff.

16 Q. J. K.?

17 A. Jody Kriss.

18 Q. J. S.?

19 A. Julius Schwarz.

20 Q. R. L.?

21 A. Ray Lee.

22 Q. And K. S.?

23 A. (No response.)

24 MR. FEINBERG: K. S.?

51 (Pages 198 to 201)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 202

1 A. I don't recall who K. S.
2 was.
3 Q. As a result of --
4 Was this software, in fact,
5 installed, at least on these monitors?
6 A. I don't recall whether these
7 additional ones were ever completed.
8 Q. Well, I think if you look
9 through, we're going to look through and
10 be able to determine that.
11 Look on page 11. There's a
12 list of computer users for this software;
13 correct?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. And I count ten here; is
16 that right?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And were all these installed
19 in those ten?
20 A. I believe so.
21 Q. Look on page 13.
22 Greenhouse, is writing, someone from
23 Greenhouse writes to you and says that,
24 "I think that in order to get J. S.

Page 203

1 working we need to reboot his laptop."
2 Do you see that?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. And then he suggests that
5 the computer has to be shut down, and if
6 it's not shut down you have to schedule a
7 reboot to occur overnight, which will
8 force any work he leaves open to close.
9 Do you see that?
10 A. I do.
11 Q. Do you recall whether this
12 was done in order to get Julius Schwarz'
13 computers under this software?
14 A. I don't recall.
15 Q. Well, look on page 22,
16 please. On October 9th, middle of the
17 page, you e-mailed someone at this
18 company and say, "Please let me know
19 about user J. S."
20 Do you see that?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. That's Julius Schwarz, isn't
23 it?
24 A. Yes.

Page 204

1 Q. And then the answer is to
2 you, "I founded activity for user J. S.
3 from 9/6/07 to 10/9/07.
4 Do you see that?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. And this e-mail was written
7 on October 9, '07, 10/9/07; correct?
8 A. Right.
9 Q. So this person had said that
10 the software was, in fact, operating on
11 Julius Schwarz' computer, at least from
12 September 6th to October 9th of '07?
13 A. That's what this e-mail
14 says.
15 Q. And none of these e-mails
16 are copied to Felix, Felix Satter, are
17 they?
18 A. Not unless they are blind
19 carbon copied, no.
20 Q. It's just between you and
21 Greenhouse, isn't it?
22 MR. OBERLANDER: Objection.
23 It's calling for a conclusion. He
24 couldn't possibly know. No one

Page 205

1 could know because a blind copy
2 won't show up.
3 MR. FEINBERG: It's --
4 BY MR. DOMB:
5 Q. Apart from blind copies, no
6 one else from Bayrock is copied; isn't
7 that true?
8 A. Not on these e-mails.
9 Q. And from your recollection
10 did you copy Felix Satter on these
11 e-mails?
12 A. Not on these, although Felix
13 Satter sent an e-mail to Greenhouse
14 authorizing this.
15 Q. How do you know that?
16 A. Because he told me he did.
17 Q. Did you see it?
18 A. I did.
19 Q. Did you tell Julius Schwarz
20 about this?
21 A. No.
22 Q. You never copied him on any
23 of this?
24 A. No.

Joshua Bernstein

Page 206

Page 208

1 Q. In fact, it was your
2 intention not to tell Julius Schwartz;
3 correct?
4 A. It was Felix's intention to
5 not tell Julius Schwarz.
6 Q. And it was your intention
7 also?
8 A. To follow my instructions,
9 yes.
10 Q. And you were aware that
11 Julius Schwarz was company counsel who is
12 an attorney for the company; correct?
13 A. I was aware, but I believe
14 at this time he was acting --
15 Yes.
16 Q. And he was superior to you
17 in the company or senior to you, was he
18 not?
19 A. Yes, he was.
20 Q. And you had the ability to
21 look at everything that he looked at on
22 his computer?
23 A. I believe I had the ability.
24 Q. And, in fact, you did look

1 A. I don't recall do that.
2 Q. Is it possible that you did
3 and you just don't recall right now?
4 A. It's possible. I don't
5 recall doing it.
6 Q. Do you think it was proper
7 for somebody without Julius Schwarz's
8 knowledge to monitor what he was looking
9 in the computer?
10 A. Absolutely. Felix Satter
11 owned the firm, so he told me to do
12 things and I was listening to the boss.
13 Q. And did he tell you this
14 verbally?
15 A. Yes, and then he wrote an
16 e-mail confirming the software should be
17 put on.
18 Q. To your knowledge, did you
19 produce a copy of that e-mail in this
20 litigation?
21 A. Perhaps, but I can double
22 check.
23 Q. Did he copy you on that
24 e-mail?

Page 207

Page 209

1 at what, from time to time at what was on
2 his computer?
3 A. I don't believe I did.
4 Q. You don't believe you did?
5 Are you a hundred percent certain of
6 that?
7 A. Not a hundred percent. This
8 is three years ago, two years ago.
9 Q. So you may have looked at it
10 and you just don't remember right now?
11 A. I don't remember.
12 Q. Did you ever copy things --
13 Did you have the ability to
14 copy, not just look, but copy things on a
15 screen?
16 A. They were generated in the
17 log filed. They were automatically
18 copied.
19 Q. So you could go to the log
20 and pull up whatever the person had
21 looked at and get a copy of it or forward
22 it to some other place electronically?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. Do you recall doing that?

1 A. I don't recall.
2 Q. If he did then that should
3 be in your inbox?
4 A. It should.
5 Q. Around what time did Felix
6 send the e-mail that you say he sent to
7 Greenhouse?
8 (Whereupon, the Witness
9 conferred with his attorney.)
10 A. Please repeat the question.
11 Q. Around what time did Felix
12 send Greenhouse the e-mail-authorizing
13 the e-mail that you say he sent?
14 A. I don't remember the time.
15 Before this date.
16 Q. On or around July 2007?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. To your knowledge did Felix
19 ever monitor the, what these various
20 computer users were looking at on their
21 computers?
22 A. I believe so.
23 Q. What's your basis for
24 believing so?

53 (Pages 206 to 209)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 210

Page 212

1 A. Because he had the
2 administrative rights and the ability to
3 do. That's what it was installed for,
4 his use.
5 Q. Did he ever tell you that he
6 did this?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. Did he ever tell you what
9 things he looked at?
10 A. No.
11 Q. Did he ever tell you
12 anything else about what he looked at or
13 why or when? Do you recall any specifics
14 about what he told you?
15 A. No.
16 MR. OBERLANDER: Which?
17 THE WITNESS: ABC.
18 MR. OBERLANDER: All of
19 them?
20 THE WITNESS: Yes.
21 MR. OBERLANDER: Wouldn't
22 that be a massive amount of
23 storage; right?
24 THE WITNESS: I'll tell you

1 Do you see that?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And then it goes on to say,
4 "We collected the requested information
5 and e-mailed it to Josh as per his
6 request."
7 Do you see that?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. What was the purpose in
10 requesting all admin passwords?
11 A. I was asked to keep a record
12 of everything, because when Greenhouse
13 was brought in they had changed
14 passwords, and we didn't have them on
15 site. So we didn't know the passwords.
16 Q. Did you need the passwords
17 in order to monitor the individual
18 computers?
19 A. No.
20 Q. So what, this was just --
21 Why did you need it then?
22 A. Recordkeeping. We didn't
23 have access I think -- maybe a day before
24 this we had some problem. We couldn't

Page 211

Page 213

1 later. I'm good.
2 MR. DOMB: You gentleman are
3 speaking on the record. Do you
4 want to share with us what you're
5 talking about?
6 MR. FEINBERG: No. There's
7 no question posed, and we can talk
8 whatever we want to talk about.
9 Pose your question and we'll
10 stop talking.
11 BY MR. DOMB:
12 Q. Please look at page 11 of
13 this exhibit, Exhibit S.
14 (Whereupon, the Witness
15 conferred with his attorney.)
16 Q. I'm sorry, 18. If I said 11
17 I meant 18.
18 A. Okay.
19 Q. There's an e-mail here on
20 September, in September 2007 from
21 Greenhouse. It says, "Josh Bernstein
22 would like a list of all admin passwords
23 along with the IP address of the servers
24 and the firewall."

1 access the server, and Greenhouse wasn't
2 able to fix it and I needed to go into
3 it, but I didn't have the password.
4 Q. So sometime in middle, in
5 the second half of 2007, based on you and
6 Felix Satter, you installed spyware on an
7 a number of individuals' computers at
8 Bayrock; correct?
9 A. I'm not sure that's the
10 appropriate term of art.
11 Q. Well, it was a spyware
12 software. You described it yourself.
13 A. No, I did not.
14 Q. Well, okay. You installed
15 spyware that enabled the administrator to
16 look at the contents of the screens of
17 all of the users that are mentioned here?
18 I think we went over this --
19 MR. FEINBERG: Object to
20 just the form, your
21 characterization. It is what it
22 is. Just take out the word --
23 A. Here's what's happening.
24 You're misspeaking.

54 (Pages 210 to 213)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 214

Page 216

1 There's two parts to what
2 you're looking at in the document. The
3 first part is a piece of software that
4 enabled the administrator to view.

5 The second part is Trend,
6 it's anti-spyware, which is the second
7 piece of software, which is specific.

8 Q. I'm focusing on the first
9 piece of software, the Spector CNE.

10 A. CNE, yes.

11 Q. And that enables the
12 administrator to look at the various
13 computer screens --

14 A. Yes, yes.

15 Q. -- as we just discussed.

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And how long was this
18 software operating at Bayrock, to your
19 recollection?

20 A. I believe from inception
21 until --

22 Q. Until the time you left
23 Bayrock?

24 A. I don't know the end date of

1 Q. Looking at Exhibit T, and I
2 notice you're leafing through it. Maybe
3 we can go a little quicker on this one.

4 Do you remember ordering
5 some services and equipment from 1&1
6 Internet Team in or around July of 2008?

7 A. Sounds about right.

8 Q. What were you ordering?

9 A. Service for website hosting
10 and e-mail.

11 Q. For different domains?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Which domains?

14 A. MiraxUK.com and
15 Bayrockinc.com and SwissCIB.com.

16 Q. Were those companies related
17 to Bayrock?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Mirax was the one that you
20 mentioned before that was a joint venture
21 with Russian entities?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What's Bayrockinc?

24 A. That was a, I believe a

Page 215

Page 217

1 it.

2 Q. But as far as you know when
3 you left Bayrock it was still
4 operational?

5 A. As far as I know.

6 MR. DOMB: Please mark
7 Exhibit T, another composite of
8 e-mails and et cetera, numbered 1
9 through 21.

10 (Whereupon, Defendant's
11 Exhibit T, a 21-page document, was
12 marked for identification as of
13 this date.)

14 MR. OBERLANDER: There's no
15 question now; correct?

16 MR. DOMB: No, but there
17 soon will be.

18 MR. OBERLANDER: I
19 understand that, but I want to
20 check something.

21 1&1 is the web hosting
22 company, right?

23 THE WITNESS: (Indicating.)

24 BY MR. DOMB:

1 Delaware company that then Felix Satter
2 took over to transfer his ownership
3 shares of Bayrock into or out of Bayrock
4 Group, LLC.

5 Q. Was that while he was still
6 working at Bayrock or after he left?

7 A. He was still employed.

8 Q. And what about Swiss CIB?
9 What is that?

10 A. That was the name under
11 which the company that Felix was trying
12 to start, Swiss Capital Investment
13 Banking, CIB.

14 Q. So these were websites that
15 each of these companies were setting up?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And you did this under whose
18 instruction?

19 A. Felix Satter.

20 Q. Was anyone else from Bayrock
21 involved in these entities other than
22 Felix, to your knowledge?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Who?

55 (Pages 214 to 217)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 218

Page 220

1 A. Alina Gorbachev, Yuliya
2 Gashapova, Stan Tolstinov, Paul McKewan
3 or Paul Mozlitz, I don't know which name
4 is legal, and at various times Julius
5 Schwarz.

6 MR. FEINBERG: I'm sorry,
7 what was the question that was
8 posed?

9 MR. DOMB: Who else at
10 Bayrock was involved in these
11 entities.

12 Give me a minute and I'll
13 get these in order.

14 THE WITNESS: Do you mind if
15 I grab bottle of water?

16 (Whereupon, a brief recess
17 was taken.)

18 Q. When your employment at
19 Bayrock ended, did you take with you or
20 retain any Bayrock documents?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. What documents?

23 A. Various documents.
24 Thousands of different e-mails and such.

1 Q. Any particular topics of
2 e-mails that you chose to print? How did
3 you choose which e-mails to print and
4 keep?

5 A. I don't recall. Usually
6 expenses.

7 Q. Is it fair to say if there's
8 anything important you were more than
9 likely to keep it than if it was wasn't
10 so important?

11 A. That's fair to say.

12 Q. Did you ever, to your
13 knowledge during your employment, write
14 an e-mail to someone at Bayrock
15 confirming a verbal discussion that you
16 had had about your compensation or bonus
17 or benefits?

18 A. Yes, but only parts of it.

19 Q. I mean, we looked at one
20 before where you wrote to Julius Schwarz,
21 remember, and I questioned you about
22 that? Let's just get a number.

23 That was Exhibit G, your
24 e-mail to Julius Schwarz.

Page 219

Page 221

1 Q. Well, did you keep them in
2 paper form or electronic form?

3 A. Both.

4 Q. What did you keep in paper?

5 A. Hundreds of documents,
6 various things that were printed out.

7 Q. Do you still have them?

8 A. I believe so.

9 Q. And in general, you say
10 hundreds of documents?

11 A. Mainly e-mails.

12 Q. So they were printouts of
13 e-mails?

14 A. Mainly.

15 Q. So you printed out e-mails,
16 hundreds of them, and kept them?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And you printed them while
19 you were employed at Bayrock?

20 A. Yes, and after.

21 Q. Where did you keep them?

22 A. In my files.

23 Q. At home?

24 A. Yes.

1 A. Oh, yes, the one where Felix
2 threatened me if I didn't write the
3 e-mail.

4 Q. Apart from that, do you
5 recall ever writing to someone at
6 Bayrock, for example writing to Felix and
7 saying, "Felix, I want to confirm our
8 conversation where you promised to do, to
9 pay me X or Y."

10 Did you write any such
11 e-mails?

12 A. You provided one here where
13 I said that you confirm our agreement
14 from yesterday, in exhibit --

15 Q. You mean the one about your
16 trip, your cancelled trip?

17 A. Yeah, and severance,
18 correct.

19 Q. Okay. Other than what we've
20 seen today, do you recall, specifically,
21 recall any other times when you wrote --

22 For example, did you write
23 an e-mail to Felix saying, "I want to
24 confirm that you promised to pay me

56 (Pages 218 to 221)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 222

Page 224

1 \$200,000, not \$100,000, in connection
 2 with the Loehmann's deal?"
 3 A. No.
 4 Q. Did you write an e-mail to
 5 Tevfik Arif saying that you expected to
 6 be paid the equivalent of a broker, a
 7 broker's fee on the Loehmann's deal,
 8 which would be about million dollars?
 9 A. No. Tevfik Arif did not
 10 have e-mail.
 11 Q. Did you write such an e-mail
 12 to anyone else at the company to let them
 13 know what deal that you say he had
 14 promised you?
 15 A. No. They were all verbal.
 16 Q. Now, getting back, you said
 17 you took paper files and you also took
 18 some electronic files with you when you
 19 left Bayrock?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. What other electronic files?
 22 A. Backup files of my e-mail
 23 and anything else that was available on
 24 my computer.

1 items.
 2 Q. Containing the same items?
 3 A. I believe so.
 4 Q. And what was in it
 5 generally --
 6 Did you go through a similar
 7 process where you selected what to put in
 8 there, or did you just download large
 9 numbers of files indiscriminantly?
 10 A. Indiscriminantly.
 11 Q. What period of time?
 12 A. From approximately
 13 December 2007 to the end of my
 14 employment.
 15 Q. Well, were you able to
 16 download things through September 16th or
 17 through some date earlier when you were
 18 in the office?
 19 A. Through September 16th.
 20 Q. So we discussed before that
 21 for some reason unknown to me and unknown
 22 to Bayrock, four months of e-mails from
 23 your sent box couldn't be found at
 24 Bayrock.

Page 223

Page 225

1 Q. Well, did you have a backup
 2 file of all your e-mails, incoming and
 3 out-going?
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. How did you --
 6 What is in that backup
 7 file -- well, let me withdraw that.
 8 Whatever you took in a
 9 backup file do you still have it, from
 10 Bayrock?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. So it hasn't changed, you
 13 haven't deleted things from it?
 14 A. I don't believe so.
 15 Q. So you still have that --
 16 Is it in a thumb drive?
 17 What kind of a --
 18 A. Portable hard drive, thumb
 19 drive.
 20 Q. And you still have it in the
 21 same condition containing the same items
 22 that it had before you left Bayrock?
 23 A. Hard to answer the question,
 24 the condition or containing the same

1 Are they in your backup
 2 drives that you've maintained all this
 3 time?
 4 A. I don't believe so.
 5 Q. Why not?
 6 A. Because I don't believe they
 7 are there.
 8 Q. But you, it was the
 9 intention when you left Bayrock to
 10 download all these files and put them
 11 into this portable hard drive; correct?
 12 A. Correct.
 13 Q. So you didn't get them
 14 either? Just like Bayrock doesn't have
 15 them you don't have them either?
 16 A. I don't believe so.
 17 Q. Do you have any explanation
 18 for where they are or what happened to
 19 them?
 20 A. Yes. Bayrock deleted them.
 21 Q. Well, the period --
 22 That's your belief. Do you
 23 have any --
 24 A. That's my belief.

57 (Pages 222 to 225)

Joshua Bernstein

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 Q. Do you have any hard 2 evidence or hard basis for saying that 3 other than your belief? 4 A. Not at this point. 5 Q. Do you, the period -- I 6 think we went over this -- the period of 7 missing sent e-mails was roughly May 8 through August or September of 2008? 9 A. I don't have it offhand. 10 Q. Approximately. I won't hold 11 you. Give or take a month; is that 12 right? 13 A. I will give that, yeah. 14 Q. So during that period did 15 you download any of your files or all of 16 your files to this portable hard drive? 17 A. During that period I did 18 download files. 19 THE WITNESS: Can I use the 20 bathroom real quick. 21 (Whereupon, a short recess 22 was taken.) 23 MR. DOMB: What's the last 24 question please.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 A. I don't know. I don't keep 2 count. 3 Q. Do you have the more than 4 one external drive containing Bayrock 5 materials? 6 A. I don't believe so. 7 Q. So you have one? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Does that, what do you call 10 that, an external drive? Is that a good 11 term for you to use? 12 A. It works. 13 Q. Does that drive contain 14 items other than Bayrock-related items? 15 A. I believe so. 16 Q. Is there a way for you to 17 separate out the Bayrock from the 18 non-Bayrock? 19 A. Should be. 20 Q. How would you do it? 21 A. Manually. 22 Q. One by one? 23 A. Absolutely. 24 Q. How many different e-mails</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 (Whereupon, the requested 2 question was read back by the 3 reporter.) 4 Q. And you said, I believe that 5 you keep these in a portable hard drive? 6 A. What are these? 7 Q. The electronic files from 8 Bayrock that you took with you? 9 A. I did. 10 Q. And you still have it? 11 A. I don't have that drive, 12 that specific drive, no. 13 Q. You transferred it to a 14 different drive? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. So the contents are still 17 there? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Does the drive have things 20 on it other than Bayrock-related items? 21 A. Does the current drive or 22 the -- 23 Q. Well, how many do you now 24 have?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1 or files are in it? 2 A. I don't know. 3 Q. When you produced documents 4 in this case you did not produce all the 5 Bayrock-related items in that portable 6 hard drive, did you? 7 A. It's all relevant documents. 8 Q. And you made the decision as 9 to what is relevant or not? 10 A. (No response.) 11 Q. Who made that decision? 12 MR. FEINBERG: You served a 13 documented request. He responded 14 to the document request. 15 MR. DOMB: I'm asking a 16 simple question. 17 Q. Who made the decision as to 18 what to produce from that drive? Was it 19 you? 20 A. Between my counsel and I. 21 Q. So did you, are there some 22 Bayrock-related materials that you did 23 not produce? 24 A. Yes.</p>

58 (Pages 226 to 229)

Joshua Bernstein

Page 230

Page 232

1 MR. DOMB: Do you have any
2 objection to producing all
3 Bayrock-related materials that you
4 have not yet produced from that
5 portable hard drive.

6 MR. FEINBERG: I guess if
7 you make a request specifically
8 we'll take it under advisement
9 whether we have a problem with it
10 or not.

11 MR. DOMB: From my review of
12 the document request I thought it
13 was very broad and it was already
14 requested.

15 But, for the record, we do
16 request that you produce promptly
17 all Bayrock-related items from
18 that drive.

19 And as you know there's been
20 a dispute. We also request the
21 ability for an independent
22 computer expert to review that and
23 make sure that that happens. So
24 we do make that request, and

1 produce some and not others, and
2 we are entitled to see all of
3 them. So we make that request.

4 MR. FEINBERG: And we'll
5 verify to see whether the request
6 that you made in terms of the
7 document response has been
8 complied with.

9 And there may be documents
10 other than those which were
11 responsive to your request, which
12 is what I assume you're asking
13 for.

14 In other words, just so
15 we're clear, you have a document
16 request --

17 MR. DOMB: I'm making two
18 requests. If we requested it and
19 it hasn't been produced, obviously
20 we want it.

21 MR. FEINBERG: Obviously.

22 MR. DOMB: And if you did
23 not read our request broadly
24 enough, we now request all

Page 231

Page 233

1 please mark that.

2 MR. OBERLANDER: That's
3 bilateral, isn't it? I think we
4 made the same request. I'm just
5 saying that it can be coordinated.

6 MR. FEINBERG: You made the
7 request, because you have missing
8 documents that we were going to
9 access to try to find out why or
10 in what manner they were deleted,
11 okay. We've never indicated that
12 we have files that have been
13 deleted or other materials that
14 require --

15 You don't get access
16 automatically to someone's
17 computer just because you want to
18 see what they have. You made your
19 request and we'll take it under
20 advisement.

21 MR. DOMB: The record says
22 what it says. There are
23 Bayrock-related materials that
24 your side made a decision not to

1 Bayrock-related items in that
2 portable hard drive, whether you
3 deem them to be within our
4 document request, or whether
5 anyone deems them to be --

6 MR. FEINBERG: That's a new
7 request, and we'll take that under
8 advisement.

9 BY MR. DOMB:

10 Q. Have you now described
11 fairly all of the Bayrock-related items
12 that you took with you after you left
13 Bayrock, that is, paper and electronic
14 files?

15 A. All of what I -- there was a
16 Blackberry that I sent back to Bayrock,
17 that I retained or sent back.

18 Q. Okay. On the Blackberry,
19 you had a Blackberry that was issued to
20 you or provided to you by Bayrock?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And after you left Bayrock
23 you sent it back?

24 A. Yes.

59 (Pages 230 to 233)

From: fred55@aol.com [mailto:fred55@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 12:33 PM
To: Kriss, Ronald (Sh-Mia); Kriss, Ronald (Sh-Mia)
Subject: Fwd: complaint, sdny, salomon, weinrich, & salomon & co.

Ron --

I recommend you forward this to Julius with the comment from me that there are three alternatives here:

- (a) I file publicly today.
- (b) I file under seal today.
- (c) He arrange a tolling agreement with EVERY defendant but nixon peabody.

I don't care how many people he has to get on the phone and how fast he has to work. He had years to give back the money and now it's over. He can get Brian Halberg to help him.

I believe it's possible to get this in under seal if Bayrock joins in a joint motion in part 1 to seal the complaint pending a redaction agreement with the assigned judge. but there are never any guarantees.

Thanks,

FMO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

05/13/2010 17:51 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

001/004

CHAMBERS OF THE
HON. NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
PHONE # 212-805-0194
FAX #: 212-805-7927

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE: 5/13/10

Frederick M. Oberlander, Esq. 212.202.7624

TO: Kelly A. Moore, Esq. / Brian A. Herman, Esq. 212.309.6001FAX#: David L. Lewis, Esq. 212.964.4506

FROM: Judge Buchwald's chambers

PAGES TO FOLLOW: 3

RE: LO CV 3959 (NRB)Kriss + Ejekam, et al. v. Bayrock Group LLC, et al.

MESSAGE:

Please see enclosed order, per
today's teleconference with Judge
Buchwald. Thanks, Mike O'Neill

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This facsimile is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this facsimile or the information herein by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone or return the facsimile by mail.

05/13/2010 17:51 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

002/004

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
JODY KRISS and MICHAEL EJEKAM, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

- against -

O R D E R

10 CV 3959 (NRB)

BAYROCK GROUP LLC et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

WHEREAS, the complaint in this case attaches and otherwise makes reference to documents which were sealed in a federal criminal case brought in the Eastern District of New York; and

WHEREAS, plaintiffs' counsel has disseminated the complaint and the exhibits thereto to certain named defendants and others, it is hereby

ORDERED that no further dissemination of the complaint and exhibits thereto or the sealed information contained therein be made pending further order of the Court; and it is further


ORDERED that plaintiffs' counsel immediately contact all persons who have received a copy of the complaint and inform them of this Court's order that there be no further dissemination of the complaint and exhibits thereto or the sealed information contained therein pending further order of the Court.

05/13/2010 17:51 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

003/004

Dated: New York, New York
May 13, 2010


NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

05/13/2010 17:51 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

004/004

Copies of the foregoing Order have been sent on this date to the following:

Frederick M. Oberlander, Esq.
Law Office of Frederick M. Oberlander
28 Sycamore Lane, Box 1870
Montauk, NY 11954
Fax: 212.202.7624

Kelly A. Moore, Esq.
Brian A. Herman, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178
Fax: 212.309.6001

David L. Lewis, Esq.
Lewis & Fiore
225 Broadway, Suite 3300
New York, NY 10007
Fax: 212.964.4506

05/14/2010 14:52 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

001/004

CHAMBERS OF THE
HON. NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
PHONE # 212-805-0194
FAX #: 212-805-7927

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE: 5/14/10

Frederick M. Oberlander, Esq. 212.202.7624

TO: Kelly A. Moore, Esq. / Brian A. Herman, Esq. 212.309.6001

FAX#: David L. Lewis, Esq. 212.964.4506

FROM: Judge Buchwald's chambers

PAGES TO FOLLOW: 3

RE: 12 CV 3959 (NRB)

Kriss + Ejekam, et al. v. Bayrock Group LLC, et al.

MESSAGE:

Please see enclosed Order, per
today's teleconference with Judge
Buchwald. Thanks, Mike O'Neill

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This facsimile is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this facsimile or the information herein by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone or return the facsimile by mail.

05/14/2010 14:52 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

002/004

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
JODY KRISS and MICHAEL EJEKAM, directly
and derivatively on behalf of BAYROCK
GROUP LLC, BAYROCK SPRING STREET LLC, and
BAYROCK WHITESTONE LLC,

ORDER

10 CV 3959 (NRB)

Plaintiffs,

- against -

BAYROCK GROUP LLC, TEVFIK ARIF, JULIUS
SCHWARZ, FELIX SATTER, BRIAN HALBERG,
SALVATORE LAURIA, ALEX SALOMON, JERRY
WEINRICH, SALOMON & COMPANY PC, AKERMAN
SETERFITT LLP, BRUCE STACHENFELD, DAVID
GRANIN, NIXON PEABODY LLP, ADAM GILBERT,
ROBERTS & HOLLAND LLP, ELLIOT PISEM,
MICHAEL SAMUEL, MEL DOGAN, BAYROCK SPRING
STREET LLC, JOHN DOES 1-100, BAYROCK
WHITESTONE LLC, BAYROCK CAMELBACK LLC,
BAYROCK MERRIMAC LLC, BAYROCK GROUP INC,
and NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE CO. OF
PITTSBURGH, PA,

Defendants,

- and -

BAROCK GROUP LLC, BAYROCK SPRING STREET
LLC, and BAYROCK WHITESTONE LLC,

Nominal Defendants
(Derivative Plaintiffs).

-----X
NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

WHEREAS, the complaint in this case attaches and otherwise
makes reference to documents which were sealed in a federal
criminal case brought in the Eastern District of New York; it is
hereby

05/14/2010 14:52 FAX 212 805 7927


Judge Buchwald

003/004

ORDERED that the original complaint be sealed pending further order of the Court; and it is further

ORDERED that a redacted version of the original complaint, redacting any sealed documents or references to sealed documents, be filed with the Clerk of the Court by May 19, 2010, to be followed by an electronic (.pdf) version of the redacted complaint.

Dated: New York, New York
May 14, 2010


NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

05/14/2010 14:52 FAX 212 805 7927

Judge Buchwald

004/004

Copies of the foregoing Order have been sent on this date to the following:

Frederick M. Oberlander, Esq.
Law Office of Frederick M. Oberlander
28 Sycamore Lane, Box 1870
Montauk, NY 11954
Fax: 212.202.7624

David L. Lewis, Esq.
Lewis & Fiore
225 Broadway, Suite 3300
New York, NY 10007
Fax: 212.964.4506

Kelly A. Moore, Esq.
Brian A. Herman, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178
Fax: 212.309.6001